



**FOREIGN
BROADCAST
INFORMATION
SERVICE**

JPRS Report

Soviet Union

Political Affairs

17 AUGUST 1987

Soviet books and journal articles displaying a copyright notice are reproduced and sold by NTIS with permission of the copyright agency of the Soviet Union. Permission for further reproduction must be obtained from copyright owner.

SOVIET UNION POLITICAL AFFAIRS

CONTENTS

PARTY, STATE AFFAIRS

- Weekly Recalls Uzbek Outrages, Rashidov Crimes
(Kamil Ikramov; LITERATURNAYA GAZETA, 10 Jun 87) 1

CULTURE

- Writers' Union Plenum Speeches
(LITERATURNAYA GAZETA, 6 May 87) 10
- M. Alekseyev on Publishing Problems, by Mikhail Alekseyev 10
Baklanov on Dudintsev, by Grigoriy Baklanov 11
Sergeyev on 'Healthy' Hero, by Yuriy Sergeyev 13
Standyuk on Death Toll Statistics, by Ivan Standyuk 15
Umarbekov on Language Problems, by Ulmas Umarbekov 18
S. Ostrovyy on Young Writers, by Sergey Ostrovyy 20
Vikulov on 'Sensational' Journals, by Sergey Vikulov 21
Estonia's Beekman on Phosphor Mines, by Vladimir Beekman 25
Mushketik on Lack of Ukrainian Schools, by Yuriy Mushketik 26
Kaipbergenov on Aral Catastrophe, by Tulepbergen Kaipbergenov 28
Amlinskiy on Komsomol's 'Nylon Boys', by Vladimir Amlinskiy 31
Bondarev on National Pride, by Yuriy Bondarev 34
Dementyev on Afghan Soldiers, by Andrey Dementyev 35
Krupin on River Diversion, by Vladimir Krupin 37
Poptsov Discusses Criticism, by Oleg Poptsov 38
Mozhayev on Opposition to Change, by Boris Mozhayev 40
Ustinov Attacks Yevtushenko, by Valentin Ustinov 42
Tsitsishvili on Georgian Theater, by Georgiy Tsitsishvili 45
S. Alekseyev Faults Young Writers, by Sergey Alekseyev 47
Suleymenov on Kazakh's Unpublished Writers, by
Olzhas Suleymenov 49

Peters on Nuclear Power in Latvia, by Yanis Peters	52
L. Vasilyeva on 'Ecology of Women', by Larisa Vasilyeva	55
Karpov's Closing Remarks, by Vladimir Karpov	57
Abkhaz Writer on 'Serious Damage' of Beria Years (Bagrat Shinkuba Interview; LITERATURNAYA GAZETA, 1 Ju 87) ...	59
History of Taganka Theater Reviewed by Actress (Alla Demidova; IZVESTIYA, 15 Apr 87)	61
Works of Vysotskiy To Be Archived in State Museum (Robert Rozhdestvenskiy Interview; TRUD, 16 Apr 87)	66
Film on Chernobyl Finally Released; Director Dies (Ye. Pozdnyakova; PRAVDA UKRAINY, 3 Apr 87)	69
SOCIAL ISSUES	
Journal Discusses Political, Legal Aspects of Glasnost (V. Kryazhkov; SOVETY NARODNYKH DEPUTATOV, No 5, May 87)	72
Legal Scholar Discusses Errors in Pretrial Investigations (Yu. Feofanov, A. Gulyayev; IZVESTIYA, 22 May 87)	83
MVD Official Answers Criticism for Ministry's Poor Performance (Vasiliy Petrovich Trushin Interview; CHELOVEK I ZAKON, No 6, Jun 87)	89
Public Opinion Studies Urged To Reflect Different Viewpoints (N. Popov; SOVETSKAYA KULTURA, 11 Jun 87)	101
Border Guard Chief Discusses Agitation Work (N. Britvin; AGITATOR, No 10, May 87)	108

/7310

WEEKLY RECALLS UZBEK OUTRAGES, RASHIDOV CRIMES

PM120800 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 10 Jun 87 p 11

[Article by Kamil Ikramov under the rubric "The Writer and Society":
"The Hour Has Struck..."]

[Text] One wonders: In which cases, domestic or political, did the ancient Romans resort to the rule: "Speak no ill of the dead"? This approach has never promoted the restoration of historical truth.

Today everyone understands the need for truth without exemptions, the whole truth about the Great Patriotic War, collectivization, the twenties and thirties. But it is worrying to find that the more remote the time is from ourselves, the more you can say about it, while the closer it is...

I am writing for LITERATURNAYA GAZETA, so I will begin with the literary activity of the chief character in this long, grave, and, for many, tragic story. The writer, whose name I am in no hurry to mention, had been published, republished, and translated, to the envy of great writers. And now the writer was 50 years old (this was exactly 20 years ago). The newspapers, radio, television, and "fat" and "thin" journals vied with each other to praise the man whose birthday was being celebrated.

"...How fine a thing it is that our realities and our life, our Motherland and our labor are 50 years old. How fine a thing it is that for more than 30 of those 50 years you have devoted all your energies and spiritual ardor, your profound intelligence and thought, the light of your eyes, all your thoughts and feelings, as well as your dreams and ideas, to these tasks... You have made your contribution to the realization of the most advanced ideals of our time, to the struggle for the future of the universe. You have played a part worthy of your great talent and pure soul in the development of the Soviet people's artistic literature and culture... You have so embodied in yourself all the best and finest features of your people that your personal, human qualities are enviable. They are remarkable modesty and exactingness, industriousness and patience, purity and thoughtfulness, steadiness and, lastly, a pleasant and winning sense of humor... We welcome the 50th spring of your life. As the people say: 'May you live while the world endures!' And may it be our good fortune to gather beautiful flowers from the garden of your creativity and form them into beautiful bouquets."

That is only part of the interminable message of congratulations to Sh. Rashidov, first secretary of the Uzbek Communist Party Central Committee, compiled by Academician V. Zakhidov, the republic's minister of culture, and printed at that time in the journal GULISTAN. Please forgive the lengthy quotation, but, first, 20 years is not such a very long time, unless it is a prison sentence, and, second, even today you can still hear people ask: "But did Rashidov know about the outrages? We know everything now, but then?"

Of course, it could be objected that the important leader did not have time to read everything that is written about him on his birthdays. But this particular message of congratulations he read for sure, if only because party worker Rasul Gulamov, a well known figure in Uzbekistan, quoted it in a letter to Rashidov. The letter spoke frankly and directly of Rashidov's lack of modesty, his consuming passion for ostentation, his encouragement of deception. The Communist was hoping to shame and bring to his senses another Communist with whom he had once worked.

No, Rashidov did not heed that letter, except to hate its author even more. He had hated Rasul Gulamovich for a long time, and probably was afraid of him. Why? In 1959, as a member of the Uzbek Communist Party Central Committee Bureau, Rasul Gulamovich objected to Rashidov's election to the post of first secretary, and exactly one-half of the bureau members shared his view.

That session was unprecedentedly long. They consulted with Moscow, they separated, met again and argued again. The doubts about the candidacy were serious, but...Rashidov was elected. By a majority of one vote. And he cast that vote himself.

It is hardly likely that Rashidov had read Machiavelli or the biography of Talleyrand, it is hardly likely that he knew much history at all. But before very long those who had voted against his nomination began to disappear from leadership posts and even from the republic, while some were "sent packing" abroad. Those who would not reconcile themselves to the situation, who continued the struggle, found themselves in a tight spot. Rasul Gulamov, for instance, remained in the republic, albeit in an insignificant post, and moreover he preserved his prestige and augmented it through his implacability, and that could not fail to annoy Rashidov as the latter gained ground. They tried to find a way to get through to Gulamov, and at the same time sought to "compromise" him, they arranged "accidents," and at the same time tried to persuade him to cooperate. Many people in Uzbekistan now who know what the atmosphere was like in those years are amazed that he survived at all. I too have reflected on this riddle, but let the reader not press me for the answer.

It is annoying to find a newly coined phrase, the "Uzbek affair," appearing in the press because of the editor's lack of political sensitivity. We know about the "Multan affair," the "Dreyfus affair," and the "Beylis affair" [all celebrated cases involving trials based on false accusations], but there is no reason to endow what happened in the republic with the name of the whole people.

Because during those decades those who suffered most of all were the people, ordinary people and their children. It was they who paid for the "black economy," it was the rubles and kopeks intended for them that were appropriated in order to bribe officials higher up the ladder, a ladder which led far beyond the bounds of the republic.

Let us remember the three laconic lines of the 22 May 1986 CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers resolution revoking the measures to perpetuate Rashidov's memory. The appeal of the 21st Uzbek Communist Party Congress to the CPSU Central Committee enumerates some of the crimes Rashidov promoted: the violation of the norms of party life and the socialist rule of law, bribery, deception, overreporting, and the promotion of cadres on the basis of kinship, home town ties, and personal devotion, and not infrequently for motives of self-interest.

Rashidov died in 1983, this resolution was adopted in 1986, and this year an assessment at last rang out from a lofty platform--the phrase "Sharaf Rashidovism." This defines with the utmost accuracy a phenomenon in which one of the central figures was "a latter-day Uzbek khan with a party card, gold stars, and prize badges." These bitter, but just and timely expressions were heard in a recent speech by R.N. Nishanov, chairman of the Uzbek SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium.

On the presidium at the meeting where these words were spoken was the old Communist Rasul Gulamovich Gulamov, a man who had held his ground and refused to yield in the struggle.

"What were you thinking about them?" I asked Rasul Gulamovich. "You had waited so many years for justice to prevail..."

"But I never felt defeated. Once I met with the then minister of the cotton ginning industry, Usmanov. At one time I knew him well, so I said: Listen to the advice of an older man, go to Moscow and repent, tell them how you and your boss overreport by a million every year. Otherwise sooner or later you will be fired, removed from the Central Committee, expelled from the party, tried, and shot. What are you talking about, he said, how can I go against Sharaf Rashidovich? Who is he, and who am I? So he was the one who was defeated, when he subjugated himself entirely to a man whose true worth he must have known. He enjoyed power, he had enormous funds at his disposal, but destruction lay in store for him... And even the fact that Usmanov immediately passed on our conversation to Rashidov made no difference, the warning came true, even in that respect, which was itself a consistent development. Both of them, and many others with them, had lost even when they thought they had won."

But I hear no note of triumph in Gulamov's voice--the final proof that he was right cost too much grief, too much damage. And I too think of Rashidov with grief, and without the slightest Schadenfreude. After all, he was once a village boy, then a schoolboy, then a student. Life gave him a rare opportunity to be the hope and pride of his people. It is a pity that he could not use that opportunity...

About 2 or 3 years before Sh. Rashidov's death, I flew from Tashkent in the late fall. It was snowing, and hundreds of thousands of schoolchildren, students, workers, and employees wearing quilted jackets were wading through the mud in the cotton fields, picking out the white cotton bolls amid the white snow... And on every street corner in the city the figure "6,000,000" was flaunted in every shape and form--a nice, even, round number! And as usual, I believed these figures, even in that difficult year.

At the airport the comrade who was seeing me off met with an acquaintance and introduced him--a doctor of economic sciences and winner of the Lenin Komsomol Prize. Purely in order to keep the desultory conversation going, I asked him whether the 6 million tons of cotton would be achieved this year.

"If Sharaf Rashidovich has promised, then it certainly will," the young doctor of economic sciences said with a grin, adding: "Only it depends on how you count the cotton. In fact we have never had more than 5 million."

Frankly, the scientist was taking a great risk in saying that to a person who was more or less a stranger. But people could no longer keep quiet. And whom could you turn to, with whom could you share your worries and grief? The newspaper? They would concoct a satirical sketch about you--a slanderer, a spiteful critic... So you shared it with each other, sometimes trusting even a slight acquaintance more than those in power.

My old acquaintance the remarkable rural teacher Mamadzhan Abdurasulov said bitterly:

"It could not go on like that any longer, Kamil. My daughter started at teachers' training school. She came home for the vacation, and asked: 'Dad, how much did you pay them to take me?' I explained that I had never given anyone any bribes. And she said: Why are you telling lies, dad? All the girls say R600-700 was paid for them."

And a student from Samarkand, whom I had never seen before, told me that for them, it is not only the entrance exams that cost money, each session costs, at a rate of R50 per subject. "And you pay too?" I asked in amazement. "No, I pass from the tank [po tanku]." "The tank?" "Don't you know? They don't charge me, because mom pays higher up."

The theorists will doubtless explain that in bypassing the stage of capitalism and passing directly from the feudal system to socialism, it is important not to forget that the masses' consciousness might not change as rapidly as such a transition requires. Alas, practice confirms this. It was indeed specifically feudal relations and bey feudalism morality which were imposed by Rashidov and his henchmen throughout the social spectrum. Kolkhozes, rayons, entire oblasts, and educational and scientific institutions became part of the patrimony. The same applied in literature, cinema, theater, cultural institutions...

Life is full of events, and a year ago I once again met with the young economist whose name I had failed to register at our first meeting at the airport. Many remarkable things had happened to him in the intervening time. He had been appointed prorector for science at the Tashkent Institute of the National Economy, and in a few months the rector and his entourage found out once and for all that this man did not suit them--he would not accept as right and proper the carefully organized system of bribes, the falsification of teaching and scientific work, nepotism, and unbridled nationalism. It did not worry anyone, for instance, that at the institute, of the 39 faculty chiefs, 34 were Uzbeks, 2 Koreans, 1 an Armenian, 1 a Jew (chief of the physical education faculty), and 1 a Russian (civil defense). My acquaintance was indignant at this distribution, although he himself is an Uzbek, because by no means all the 34 had the right to call themselves scientists, but many of them were related to each other and to influential people in the republic, and many put their sons and daughters into "their" institute and found them places on their "own" postgraduate study courses...

The institute's leadership, bound closely by family ties, operated according to a tried and tested system. There ensued a series of anonymous complaints, and the prorector was not only removed from the institute, but almost expelled from the party. It was only after the intervention of the prosecutor's office and the USSR Ministry of Higher and Secondary Specialized Education that justice was finally restored, and even then not in everything, not totally.

Being bound by mutual "ties" is a great force, the clans are ramified and have deep roots. The people responsible for education and culture were repeatedly criticized at Uzbek Communist Party Central Committee plenums and in the central and local press. But here openness is interpreted as meaning that the writer writes a bit and the reader reads a bit. They do not hurry, they wait and see. It doesn't really matter how things turn out! These people want the restructuring to take place in their own ranks: reforming now into two columns, now into four. It is easier to hide behind someone else's back.

It was said at the Central Committee plenum in Tashkent in March that those arrested for embezzlement and bribe-taking include Khudayberdiyev, former chairman of the Council of Ministers; Osetrov, former Central Committee second secretary; Orlov, former deputy chairman of the Supreme Soviet Presidium; five former obkom first secretaries... These are major posts, and they were major abuses too. So has the root of the evil been extirpated? Not for nothing did the plenum stress that the resolute replacement of cadres and the steadfast calling to account of corrupt officials is only the elimination of consequences, not of causes.

Causes--that is our common task, and a far more complex one. Its particular difficulty lies in the fact that the criminals and their patrons are rallied more closely than ever before. Formerly they were self-confident and disunited, because they believed in their own impunity. They could even allow themselves intestine strife, one oblast mafia could be at war with

another for years on end. Today they have forgotten their old disputes and are united against a common enemy--justice and restructuring; you and me.

The other day saw the end of the trial of one of the "has-beens" closest to Rashidov--Karimov, former first secretary of Bukhara obkom, the court sentenced him to the extreme measure of punishment--to be shot. My LITERATURNAYA GAZETA colleague Vladimir Sokolov, who was present at the trial in Tashkent, said to me: "This trial will only be a lesson when every detail of it is made public. When we can assess not only the personality and behavior of the defendant, but also the witnesses, people who only yesterday were important and grand, and are turning before our eyes into small, cowardly, ingratiating people."

It is sad that it was Uzbekistan which was one of the main proving grounds where the social evil tested its strength. It is sad that it was here that special principles of cadre selection became established. The people who proved to be most reliable were those whose own hands were dirty, who had some crime or other behind them. This made the "cadres" absolutely manageable, useful for abuses on any scale, and called into being a special kind of nationalism mingled with demagoguery and hypocrisy, while the ideas of the people's friendship steadily departed from real life and found their way into reports, into the sumptuous Museum of the Peoples' Friendship. A strange phrase, you will agree!

Soon after the war I lived in Kazakhstan, and in remote mountain villages I saw girls and women who wore woven into their plaits, instead of necklaces, the medals "For Valor," "For the Victory Over Germany," for Budapest, Prague, Stalingrad... The whole of Europe jingled in the plaits of girls by their tents in the Betpak-dala desert! I also saw the people who had brought the medals to the desert. They were shepherds, plowmen, drivers. And sometimes guests from the capital visited their relatives in the steppe. The lights of the cross-country vehicles shone over the steppe, the guests stepped out of the cars in fashionable suits of covert cloth and gabardine raincoats. Beings from another planet! It was from them that I heard for the first time arrogant words about other nations, about their neighbors in the region, and about those whom war and misfortune had brought to the wide open spaces of Asia.

Much later, while working on a novel, I traced in the archives and old publications the origins of bourgeois nationalism in the backwoods of the Russian empire, and became firmly convinced that the victory of October, in these regions, was determined by Lenin's conceptions on the nationalities question.

In recent decades the problems of international education have been studied in too general terms, and research has been more a matter of proposing toasts. It has been as if V.I. Lenin's works on the nationalities question belong to the distant past, and we can make do with quotations from Stalin's speeches. The great "expert" on national relations was Beria, who frequently put his "theories" into practice.

Coming out against chauvinism, V.I. Lenin stressed repeatedly that it is the great-power attitude that produces and provokes nationalism in small nations. "As representatives of the great-power nation of the extreme east of Europe and a good proportion of Asia, it would behove us ill to forget the tremendous significance of the nationalities question;--especially in a country which is rightly called the 'peoples' prison'..." It is awkward to recall what is common knowledge, but it is necessary, because this characterization of national relations in the Russian empire has been carefully banished even from school textbooks. There are apparently people who are prepared to assume responsibility for the czars and who believe that distorting the past will improve the future.

Soviet people speak more than 100 languages, and in each of them the words "nationalism" and "chauvinism" have a negative sense, the same as "national socialism." All the same, the lack of openness and bombastic hypocrisy have led here too to a situation where many of our young contemporaries are ignorant about this extremely important question. An article in MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI rightly correlated the disturbances in Alma-ata with events of 30 years ago in Tbilisi. If the Georgian young people of that time had known the truth about Stalin, no provocateurs would have been able to inflame them. The same situation in Kazakhstan recently--the lack of openness and reluctance to "stir up the past"--led to dramatic results.

A word about "national privileges." A school leader who enters the institute because of family ties or a bribe becomes a "specialist," on whose conscience are human lives if he has a doctor's diploma, people's fates if he graduates as a lawyer, technical laggardness if he is considered an engineer. However, when it was a question of personal prosperity, no way would these "specialists" seek treatment from doctors like themselves; they went to Moscow and Leningrad. There they found skilled people who were prepared to write a dissertation, monograph, novel, or poem on their behalf. And why not, if Rashidov himself set the example?

Textual studies of the works of the writer Sh. Rashidov would doubtless help to identify the true authors, but this is a subject not for researchers, but for investigators. And the investigators are currently busy with another of our literary figures, the poet Khaydar Yakhyayev, former minister of internal affairs, butcher, and sadist. The poems were by no means the worst thing the minister did, because the poems were done for him by other people who preferred to remain anonymous. Though the people who wrote rapturous reviews of the ministerial doggerel are famous and even quite popular.

But let us return to our "specialists." Distinguished by academic degrees and crowned with titles and awards, they talked louder than anyone about national pride, yet themselves freely exploited other people's minds and other people's knowledge to inflate their own prestige. Many smart swindlers and idlers fed off Uzbekistan, finding lavish prosperity and honor here. The crooks fed like parasites on the "peoples' friendship," and the local rogues fed like parasites on them. And together they fed like parasites on our people.

"Is it true, as they say, that one of your rayon officials, during his lifetime, built himself a tomb as fine as Gur-emir [15th century mausoleum in Samarkand]? A dome, a sarcophagus, and in a separate building a photographic record of his career, starting from his days as a pioneer. When the tomb was ready, and it was not yet time to die, this person added a third building, where he installed a bar stocked with foreign drinks. Is this true, or is it just gossip?"

People ask, but I don't know how to answer. I myself have not been to the legendary mausoleum, the person is still alive, but he languishes far away from his burial vault, which may be deemed to be material evidence in a criminal case. What will happen to it now, whether it will house a discotheque or a museum of atheism--that I don't know.

Rumors! This means that not everything is yet in order as regards openness, since there is a place for it in our life. And again, people say to me, looking me hard in the eyes:

"Do you really think Rashidov knew about that?"

In "his" republic he knew and controlled everything. And what he feared most of all was that someone else might find out everything that he alone knew. It was a simple matter to make a mortal enemy of him--just try washing dirty linen in public.

Realizing that his appeal directly to Rashidov had yielded no result, Rasul Gulamov wrote to the Politburo. The lackeys publicly promised their master that they would bring him the troublemaker's head on a plate, highly experienced intriguers planned provocations, and professional falsifiers prepared a "dossier." So how come Gulamov stood firm and stayed alive?

Gulamov acted in the open, he continued to appeal to the highest party organs, adding more and more irrefutable arguments, not despairing, but not becoming embittered either. Nothing could shake the Communist's stance. To kill him on the quiet would mean calling down commissions and investigations from the center, because his confrontation with Rashidov had become common knowledge. I know an important scientist who held a high administrative post; they tried to force him to come out against Gulamov, but he refused, and fell into long disgrace. And there were many such people, because everyone who was personally acquainted with Rasul Gulamovich and had felt the influence of his conviction could not go against his conscience even under extreme pressure.

I am writing about Gulamov's struggle, and I keep thinking about his opposite, Sharaf Rashidov. As a journalist I met with him several times and had quite long talks with him, and I can testify quite definitely that he was an unusually capable man, had an excellent memory, and knew how to win over anyone who was seeing him for the first time. Rashidov's path to crime can be regarded as a tragedy of personality. If Rashidov's sophisticated tactical intelligence had been channeled into chess, he would have been a grand master, if not a champion. But he played a very different game...

Rashidov honored strength and scorned democracy, for him people were "wheels" and "cogs," and this trait is also important to an understanding of his personality. As, I believe, is his unquenchable, self-satisfying passion for orders, medals, and all kinds of regalia. Alas, each of Rashidov's awards marked more losses for the Uzbek people and the Uzbek land. His "services" are now reflected in millions of hectares of land spoiled by salt and a thousand criminal cases, very high child mortality and extremely low meat consumption. It is to his "credit" that the republic's culture, literature, and art humbly emulated his works, which in their turn, in his last years, emulated "Malaya Zemlya" and "The Virgin Lands."

History has its reckoning. For just over 3 years Rashidov's body rested where the toadies had decreed--in the center of the city, with the Lenin monument on the right, Lenin Street on the left, and opposite a branch of the Lenin Museum. A true Leninist--that was the implication. But the time has come to call everything by its true name, and the remains of the "Leninist" had to be reburied.

Rasul Gulamovich now heads the republican Council of War and Labor Veterans, the backbone of which is made up of principled people like himself, people who will not tolerate shortcomings--the conscience and wisdom of our people.

Life is long, as it turns out. Everyone makes this discovery for himself. Life is long, there is room for both the punishment of vice and the triumph of virtue. There is a time for everything.

It may appear that in talking about the events of the past I have only the past in mind. But the feudal bey consciousness is tenacious, and does this only apply to us? True, today's beys do not go about in turbans and brocade coats, they do not ride black steeds. Someone aptly christened them "playbeys," because of their loose ideas about the good life. Restructuring is in progress, but some people are once again getting drunk on the opportunities that are opening up and forgetting all about those who pay for their comfort with exhausting work in the fields, those who now have most need of just, intelligent, responsible decisions by the authorities. Will everyone learn the necessary lessons from the past--that is the key question of the restructuring in the republic, that is what our future depends on.

A struggle for renewal, for new cadres, is under way in the republic. The principles of socialism must triumph in every sphere of life, and that means--to each according to his labor and to each according to his deserts. This is not to everyone's liking, but everyone will have to take a look at himself and remember that the restructuring needs builders, not time-servers.

/9604

CSO: 1830/610

WRITERS' UNION PLENUM SPEECHES

M. Alekseyev on Publishing Problems

Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 6 May 87 p 2

[Speech by Mikhail Alekseyev (Moscow)]

[Excerpts] Any event that is equivalent in its transforming essence to a revolution comes into being in stages, gradually, and matures in the thick of the people's life. Therefore, this process too is a long, frequently agonizing one. It is for just that reason that we say: the party and the Soviet people have through suffering achieved a great restructuring which has rocked all strata of society and all spheres of life to the very depths.

Soviet literature--and this should be said without false modesty--has taken an active part in the approach of this grandiose event. Moreover, it has helped our party identify and name many painful spots in the life of society which were discussed with full force at the April 1985 CPSU Central Committee Plenum and then at the 27th Congress. Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev talked of just this in a recent six-hour conversation with the leaders of the mass information media.

But how difficult it was to suggest to some comrades that all good writers are difficult writers. And they are difficult because they respect themselves and defend their point of view to the last word and because they try to speak the truth. But truth, of course, has never been and will hardly ever be easy.

I am talking about all this in detail because today some literary figures are prepared to declare themselves alone or some "gang of four" the only guardians of the truth. So they say: there are four of us but we are a majority. You must be a little more modest, guys. Let us be conscientious before those who in inconceivable conditions created the spiritual values which are the basis of the house we are erecting. When the party speaks of the enormous potential created by our people in the last 70 years, it also has in mind the spiritual moral potential without which all other values could hardly be lasting and dependable. The process of negation is, of course, more emotional, like any process of destruction: it involves noise, thunder, and affirmation by means of applause--this form of discord is really coming into fashion lately. The

process of creation is quieter and less impressive--one must think and do the work in a concentrated manner rather than make noise.

A few words about internationalism--the foundation of foundations of our social existence. How do I understand it? It seems to me that the shortest path to the hearts of other peoples is through the heart of one's own people. In other words, from the national to the international.

I will never believe that a person who did not love his mother could love another. The place you appeared on God's earth, whether it was a small village or a city, is usually called the small homeland. I think that such a definition is not precise. Wouldn't it be better to call it, this small village, the kernel from which the eternal tree of love for the Fatherland grows?!

I often hear the cheerful little song "My Address Is Not a House and Not a Street..." I hear it and I think: "But what's so good about that, when you don't have either a 'house or a street'?" And this makes me remember the cruel days on the front when we would bend over a comrade who had just been killed and first of all look in his pants pocket for the tiny acorn-sized locket where his address was kept...

And the last thing I would like to mention.

Dear comrades! Having undertaken the restructuring, let us be vigilant and circumspect so that our great restructuring takes place with minimal sacrifices and so that the baby is not thrown out with the bath water, as they say. Let us take advantage of the great blessings of democracy and consolidate our ranks in order to strengthen, affirm, and deepen socialist principles rather than undermine and shatter them.

In short, let us restructure ourselves but not cut ourselves into pieces!

Let us guard all the 70 years of our October! The Soviet people have paid a great price for each one of them!

Baklanov on Dudintsev

Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 6 May 87 p 2

[Speech by Grigoriy Baklanov (Moscow)]

[Text] In all my life there has been no time for literature like today. Obviously there was at some time, but for as long as I have lived I do not remember such a time. We entered literature in the most difficult times. But obviously people become accustomed to good times quickly. This was already heard in the report, and in yesterday's article by Petr Lukich Proskurin the question already arose: aren't we printing a great deal of material that was not printed before? Undoubtedly, there must be selection. But the life which existed decades ago and which we are now discussing is not past life; it is our present life since history is a single stream and causes and effects are inseparable.

We did not print Tvardovskiy's long poem "By Right of Memory" under the rubric "Literary Legacy"; we opened our journal with it. Because that is our pain. And our passion. And so far it is the high point of the current year. Nor did we print Bek's novel as a literary legacy. In addition to everything else, we have our guilt before these people who departed from life without having held their books in their hands. And how contemporary Bek's novel is! I am not only speaking of my perception--take the fourth issue of NAUKA I ZHIZNI; it includes an indepth study by Doctor of Economic Sciences G. Popov, a study of our economy based on reading the novel.

And many books still await publication. We must take a serious rather than disdainful attitude toward this. It is our cultural wealth too, after all.

The best books being published today stand comparison with the best of the past which are now being published. Written about 5 years ago, A. Pristavkin's story stands comparison. It is a deep, humane book. We would be poorer without it.

We have been speaking of LITERATURNAYA GAZETA here. Let us not forget that LITERATURNAYA GAZETA laid the groundwork for restructuring as perhaps no other paper did. But the fact that its first section is weaker even now reflects our present state of mind. The first section reflects the fact that we have not learned how to accept criticism. We are glad when a courageous prose work is printed without deletions. We are glad about the sociopolitical commentary which is now being printed. But as soon as criticism begins to speak in a courageous voice, indignation immediately ensues. What is this, another kind of literature? An inferior kind of literature? A lower class, perhaps?

We reached agreement at our 8th congress that there should be no hierarchy in our literature. I want to repeat the words spoken from the rostrum of the Komsomol congress: "The socialist way of life can know only one hierarchy--the hierarchy of personal merit based on abilities, knowledge, and experience, force of character, and aspirations to high social ideals." Yes, precisely aspirations to high social ideals. Literature does not exist and cannot exist without that. And literature, like all our life, needs openness [glasnost].

Openness is not an ornament of life, and we do not need openness to look good and decent to people abroad. And not because there is no morality without openness. Openness is also necessary because without comparing different points of view and without seeking different variants, the development of both the economy and science is impossible. Without that there is stagnation and the death of society. And the tragedy of Chernobyl would not have occurred if not for the long years of no openness and the irresponsibility and slipshod attitudes engendered by it. And the desire to file the report, whether the thing was done or not.

But openness means even greater responsibility for each of us, greater responsibility for what we say and do. But within these walls--between the congress and the plenum--altogether irresponsible speeches have resounded. And not only within these walls. They lead nowhere.

I saw a meeting with young people on television. It is true that the young people were really not so very young. Many of them complained: they are not getting published. But now the publication of V. Dudintsev's novel is finished. This man did not complain; he was writing his novel for 30 years. And he has a family with lots of children. And he did not provide himself with any special means to exist. This feat is a feat of courage. But really, what was he guided by? Only one thing: a passionate desire to deliver the book to his people. As Lapatkin, the hero of the novel "Not by Bread Alone," dreamed to deliver his invention to the people. Dudintsev is not at our plenum: he is, after all, not a member of the governing body. But compared to this courage and to the fact that the man tried for decades to get his way, today's insults and grieving are truly nothing. Let us make more demands on ourselves. One reads mountains of manuscripts before something sparkles. But it sparkles. So we have printed G. Golovin's story "Anna Petrovna"--it was mentioned in the report--and Shmelev's "Pashkov House." Submit stories and short stories, we are waiting. I repeat: there has never been such a time and there have never been such circumstances for literature. And there is nothing for us to divide--we must do the work all together.

We are thinking about the future and it is very good that we are concerned about the past. But there are times when not only the future but also the past depend on the present. So it was during the war: if we had not won in that present, no past would have remained to us and no future would have existed. Now is such a time. A difficult time. The gigantic restructuring of the economy and the country has begun. The first years may not be the best; it will get better later. And in these conditions help is expected from us. So let us help in the restructuring!

Sergeyev on 'Healthy' Hero

Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 6 May 87 p 3

[Speech by Yuriy Sergeyev (North Asetian ASSR)]

[Text] We have gathered here from all the corners of the country but we have only one task--to choose the correct and true path for moving our literature forward. And only the Leninist principle of struggle for the truth defines this path across the debris of stagnation and dogmatism.

As you know, Lenin always spoke the truth even to his enemies and he was victorious. We must first of all think of the unity of writers, examine and interpret why polarization of our creative unions occurs, and by common efforts decisively rebuff provocateurs, troublemakers, and revisionists who bring dissension and chaos. We must rebuff all those who on the sly smear tar on the gates of our common home.

So-called "mass culture" has overwhelmed the West with filth, sex, murders, violence, and brutality, and it was rock-and-roll that opened up the way to this. A five-million member association of teachers and parents has now been formed in America. It is waging a public campaign and trying to get a hearing in Congress and their angry slogan is "Enough Rock! Not a Step Further!" If you adhere to the three-level division of culture accepted in the West--"high"

culture for the highbrows, "middle" culture for the middlebrows, and finally "mass" culture for the lowbrows--the overwhelming majority of rock today is for the lowest strata of this pie--for the "thickskulled." But then in our press we read an article where heavy metal rock is presented as something superhuman and necessary. I saw an evening of rock on the banks of the Neva, and it was awful that such a perverted desecration of our history could occur with impunity in the city of Lenin during the year of the 70th anniversary of October.

False values... We are all tired of them, of borrowed Western raving, of flouting what is sacred and unique to the peoples of our country. Rock thunders from television sets and the radio and the press sings its praises. What is this?

There are veterans of the front here; go out and see these rascals and say what you have to say.

Let us take the journal NASH SOVREMENNİK. It sides with restructuring. Its tasks include the decisions of the 27th Party Congress and the 7th Writers' Union Congress. It publishes short honest articles on the condition of our society. In recent decades the journal has served as a starting point for the best works of Astafyev, Belov, Bondarev, and Rasputin. But judging from our press, it would seem there is no such journal. Criticism unfairly defames it; someone falls asleep and dreams that NASH SOVREMENNİK will sink to describing everyday events and squabbles and cease to be a leader of Soviet literature. We will not allow it! If we have openness and democracy, let each do what he will: some will do what is necessary and white, and some--what is ignoble and black. Let us give the right of evaluation and choice to the people and the party. I think that they will sweep false values aside.

Let us put away personal ambitions and pretensions and think about the young generation of writers. Oh, how difficult it is for them to live! There are many costs and anonymous letters and in local creative unions there is no time for real concern about our replacements. If young writers who will put their shoulders under the block of our people's literature are not found in the state, everything will crash down and go to rack and ruin. The price is a pittance to us, and the people will curse us forever.

No one will write books for us, no one will find creative replacements for us, no one will overcome inertia and stagnation for us. We must soberly consider and evaluate mistakes, overcome complacency, not fear self-criticism, and unite into a unified multinational nucleus. We must unite all our efforts in the ideological struggle to renew society.

There is no other solution but democratization of creative unions. Only the human factor, only faith in the spirit of power of the people can bring us to the progressive frontiers.

Let us be vigilant. We must fight against the making of morons of young people by "mass culture." That is the most important thing now. Heavy metal rock--with all its symbolism of the order of Medieval executioners and with its destructive program of the obliteration of culture and the erection of the

"church of Satan"--is not music but a movement of bourgeois psychology. In our literature we must fight for a psychologically healthy and strong hero which our young people need desperately today. We must seek real people's heroes who are morally prepared to fight against evil and prepared to be the first to rise from the trenches and go on the offensive for our land. We do not need foreign values and resuscitation, or the introduction of the faceless chaos of "mass culture" which is destructive and alien to progress.

Work, work, and work--that is the slogan of the times!

Standyuk on Death Toll Statistics

Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 6 May 87 pp 3, 4

[Speech by Ivan Standyuk (Moscow)]

[Excerpt] Esteemed Comrades! Many of you have probably read the letter published in MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI from former members of the Soviet literary and artistic intelligentsia who found refuge abroad. The very fact of this publication arouses bewilderment. But the audacity of the advice to us contained in the letter is even more striking.

In particular, the advice recommends to us, and I quote:

"... Stop using the tragedy of our people during World War II for propaganda purposes, remove from school curricula the disquieting military-patriotic training which has become compulsory in all Soviet schools and which can only be compared to the rehearsing of Nazi youth, and put an end to the militarization of Soviet society"...

In my opinion, these gentlemen have nothing to worry about since if yesterday's SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA is to be believed, the study of the history of the Great Patriotic War is given only 8 class hours in the 10th grades of our schools.

It makes me sad that the report had little to say about the tasks of military-artistic literature which should sound more strongly today than it does. But it is good that Dmitriy Antonovich Volkonov and Aleksandr Alekseyevich Mikhaylov talked about it. I expected that Baklanov, a good military writer and the chief editor of the journal ZNAMYA, would talk about it since ZNAMYA was founded as a military-patriotic journal. Unfortunately, this journal long ago took another tack, but it would be good if it returned to this theme, considering that our newspapers and other journals deal with the military-patriotic theme only on 9 May and 23 February.

It is not difficult to surmise that the authors of the letter which I cited would very much like it if we stopped writing and publishing books about the Great Patriotic War which depict the victory of the Soviet people and our party in the struggle against the fascist enslavers. I am sorry to say that I had heard similar things from some of my Moscow colleagues earlier. One well-known prose-writer, speaking in the office of the first secretary of the Moscow Writers' Organization in the presence of several secretaries,

sardonically stated that the time would soon come when my books on the war would be anathema and I myself would be ashamed of them. You yourselves understand that it is not too comfortable to defend yourself and stand up for your books. But my colleagues were silent, apparently taking the words of the writer as irresponsible chatter or a throwback to the group sentiments of former times. But a splinter pierced my heart... And then I still had to enter into polemics with a frontline soldier and writer whom I respect a great deal, but on a most serious subject--the attitude toward the casualty figures in the Great Patriotic War. My opponent tried to prove that our victory was achieved at such a great cost in blood that, considering the much smaller losses of the enemy, it could not be considered a Victory and those who were in command of the armed struggle of the Soviet people not only do not deserve a kind word but, on the contrary, should be expelled from our history or be held up to shame forever. I cannot permit myself to give an absolutely categorical evaluation of the events which occurred on our fronts in 1941-1942. I know and I saw with my own eyes that there were miscalculations and mistakes on the part of the Soviet command which led to unjustified losses, and there were cases when the military experience and technical support of the Nazi troops substantially and even tragically, for us, surpassed the combat capabilities of the Red Army. But I will assert with full conviction that in the difficult unequal battles of 1941-1942, the Red Army laid the foundation for the 1945 Victory. And as for the ratio of casualties sustained by us and by our enemies (I repeat, by our enemies, since the troops of Finland, Hungary, Romania, Slovakia, Spain, and Italy in addition to Germany's rose up against us), first, we must also take into account their casualties, which we forget for some reason. Secondly, we must also take into account that Soviet people killed in the German concentration camps on the territory of the Soviet republics and during the punitive operations by the Nazis against our civilian population are also included in the number of our casualties.

In 1983 the juridical literature publishing house published a book entitled "Ni davnosti, ni zabveniya" [Neither Prescription Nor Oblivion] which on the basis of the Nuremberg Trials reports that in the Soviet republics the following number of people were killed by the fascists: in the RSFSR--1,793,000; in the Ukraine--4,497,000; in Belorussia--2,198,000; in Latvia--644,000; in Lithuania--666,000; in Estonia--125,000; and in Moldavia--64,000. In all there were 9,987,000 people, who, as the USSR Ministry of Defense Military History Institute asserts, are included in the total number of 20 million human lives that our people lost in the Great Patriotic War.

But if you are speaking of our enemies' casualties, you must not forget that after entering their territory Soviet troops did not kill either the civilian population or prisoners of war.

But of course, it would be monstrous if we began to justify our casualties which could have been avoided, just as canceling the world-historical significance of our victory over German fascism because of unjustified casualties would be harmful. And we must not deprive any of the writers who participated or did not participate in the war of the right to have their own opinions about it and express them in their books. And if these opinions are not to someone's taste or seem wrong, he must not try to destroy the opponent but try to prove he is right calmly without ranting, relying on sensible

arguments. Otherwise, a person might intentionally or unintentionally or even unnoticed to himself become close-minded in his views and in the tone of their expression to those foreign advisors mentioned above who very much want us not to indoctrinate our youth in the military-patriotic spirit.

Unfortunately, our indoctrination of young people by means of literature and art is presently far from meeting the command of the times, the concerns by which the world lives, and the tasks to increase the defense capability of our Motherland. People at the recent plenum of the All-Union Council of Veterans of the War and Labor spoke very convincingly of this.

But I would like to share with you the pain which I felt, perhaps for the first time with such sharpness, upon reading Andrey Voznesenskiy's poem "The Ditch," published in YUNOSTI. It tells the story of the monstrous case of how 10 kilometers from Simferopol the grave where 12,000 Soviet citizens executed by the fascist butchers are buried was dug up. Night after night someone looked for gold there, breaking human skulls and extracting crowns on teeth.

And this, unfortunately, is not the only case of unprecedented sacrilege which we must think about and which the recent publications in SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA and KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA confirm. But I will have my say: several days ago I received a letter from Murmansk Oblast from Vladimir Vasilyevich Shuvalov, whom I do not know. Along with the letter he sent cuttings from the newspaper POLYARNAYA PRAVDA. There is a report from female correspondent A. Kalinichenko, which overflows with pain and sad reflections on what occurred last year.

Six drunk rogues took a rifle without a butt-stock and ammunition and went fishing on motorcycles. Along the way they stopped in at the Valley of Glory. They drank beer there near the monument. One took the rifle and began to fire at empty bottles and then--at the monument itself. The rifle was passed from hand to hand... They fired at a circle drawn in the center of the monument...

But what kind of people were they? Almost all were Komsomol members aged 15-23 and many of them had served in the army.

In all they took 50 shots at the memorial, although, of course, the point is not how many and not that the evil was punished: everyone but the juvenile Pertsev was sentenced to serve 3 to 5 years in a strict-regime colony. Pertsev was also sentenced to 3 years, but with postponement of the sentence for 2 years.

And this is how the POLYARNAYA PRAVDA correspondent concludes his afterword to the trial: "The state's indictment at the trial was on behalf of all of us. But the state's indictment was at the same time an indictment of all of us."

When I hear how coarsely and tactlessly and at times even hostilely people react to the privileges granted by the state to war veterans, I do not accuse only those people, because we, society as a whole, are all guilty--we have not managed to teach respect, esteem, and a grateful attitude toward war veterans and toward our history...

These reproaches apply to us as well.

And then the newspaper reports the following facts:

1978--three military graves on Sredniy Peninsula were opened. 1981--a military burial place on the island of Serdtse was opened. 1983--a fence was stolen from the fraternal grave of the soldiers of the 6th Guards' Battery. 1984--31 graves of Soviet soldiers at the 70th kilometer of the Pechenga Highway were opened and robbed. Soldiers boots and gas masks removed from the earth were scattered there. Skulls were hung on sticks near the bonfire and the remains were thrown from the graves.

In the fall two people came to Podkova Lake for a little fishing. They put their things in the fisherman's hut and began to make a fire in the stove. In a few minutes one was dead and his comrade seriously wounded. Someone's hand had put a 70-millimeter German shell under the wood in the stove.

Esteemed comrades!

I do not consider myself to have the right to appeal to you for something. Writers ideas are born not by appeal from the rostrum of their colleagues but at the call of the heart and the behest of conscience. But I will only say that whatever creative task we are working on, it is our sacred duty to remember and think about the young people to whom the future belongs.

And the future is inconceivable without respect for our past and without the young generation understanding the inconceivably complex, difficult, tragic, and heroic paths by which our people have come to the present.

Umarbekov on Language Problems

Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 6 May 87 pp 4, 5

[Speech by Ulmas Umarbekov (Uzbekistan)]

[Excerpts] Today when we are speaking of the problems of contemporary times and its representation in literature, it is impossible not to treat our party, its Central Committee, and the 27th Congress with a deep feeling of gratitude. Because today one can speak about the present not in an undertone and not in half truths but openly and directly, sensing one's participation in all the causes in our society. In the not-so-distant past some writers withdrew into history not only out of love for the olden times but also in search of answers to the burning questions of the present. But the fate of those who wanted to write and speak the truth about the present day and about the state of affairs in the countryside and in the city was not enviable.

I can in no way forget the hullabaloo in our republic over Abdulla Kakhkhar's play "Golos uz groba" [A Voice from the Grave]. The recognized master whose 80th birthday we will soon celebrate, without him unfortunately, wrote about corruption, intrigues, and bribery. And vicious criticism fell upon the play and on the performance from the pages of the press and the rostrums of meetings. The performance was in fact closed. The same thing happened with

his story "Ptichka-nevelichka" [Itsy-Bitsy Birdie]. Thanks to Moscow and the intervention of the USSR Writers' Union and of Konstantin Simonov personally as the translator of this story, an end was put to the accusations of distortion of reality against the author. The path to the audience was also difficult for the Uygun's play on the moral degradation of the chairman of a kolkhoz with the Star of Hero of Labor who turned the farm into his own estate. There are quite a few of these examples. I want to say that the road of real literature to the present and to our contemporaries has not been easy and has not been strewn with roses; it has been silenced, disparaged, and persecuted. But it existed, it lived, and it struggled.

But, unfortunately, some of our colleagues are actively - anding restructuring of others, and doing so in a tough, nervous manner, not seeing even the smallest shoots of new ways in them, while at the same time forgetting completely about their own participation in restructuring not only as literary figures but as citizens of a great country.

Genuine democracy dictates the equality of the disputing sides, mutual respect, and the dignity of Man. And whichever side of the verbal barricade we are on, we must remember, as M.S. Gorbachev said, the main thing--improving the life of Soviet man and increasing his sophistication and moral make-up, putting aside petty group interests.

The plenum of the our union's governing board was dedicated to this main cause and we named it "The Fraternity of Literatures--The Community of Young People." The young people themselves prepared the plenum. Their speeches were sharp, but impartial. Sluggishness in the work of the Writers' Union and its printing organs was justly criticized. But everyone was unanimous in one respect: writers face many tasks! This means the struggle under the leadership of the republic's party Central Committee against recruiting schoolchildren for agricultural work at the expense of their studies and for new, objective coverage by science of the literature of the 1920's and 1930's; we must mention writers' active participation in compiling new history textbooks and a reader of artistic literature for high schools, in updating the work of the Writers' Union and the publishing houses, and in establishing and strengthening more business-like and concrete ties with the writers of the fraternal republics. The plenum showed that by continuing the traditions and causes of their elder comrades the young generation of writers of Uzbekistan will be religiously committed to the fraternity of Soviet peoples and literatures and uncompromising toward occurrences alien to the Soviet way of life.

Also at the plenum the question arose of more indepth study of the Russian language, the language of communication among the peoples of the USSR which also helps to propagandize our literature. It is no secret that fellows from the kishlaks of the republic have a hard time in the ranks of the Soviet Army, with it complicated military equipment. The fact that Uzbek writers writing in the Russian language, the language of great Lenin, were discriminated against in the not-so-distant past is completely incomprehensible today. The experiences of the bilingual writers Ch. Aytmatov, T. Zulfikarov, and T. Pulatov deserve every approval and encouragement.

We say: when a star falls, a person dies. In the past quite a few "stars" of literature "fell" because of slander, envy, and personal discord. The time has come for open discussions when democratism is becoming the norm of our life. We must value these times, protect one another, and value the title of Soviet writer, proudly called the conscience of the people and the keeper of its truth, hopes, and despairs so that not one star falls, but shines brightly in the sky of our multinational Soviet literature.

S. Ostrovyy on Young Writers

Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 6 May 87 p 5

[Speech by Sergey Ostrovyy (Moscow)]

[Excerpts] Only a short time has passed since our writers congress and yet I want to pose the question: what has changed in the Oblonskiy house? Something should have changed, after all. No matter how much we make judgments and lay down rules here today, no matter how many lofty words we speak, everything will rest upon how we organize the literary process. Zalygin spoke correctly about this today. We can work on whatever lofty materials we want, but the production process exists. And I understand restructuring to mean that above all and in the main we must normalize the literary process; and to do this at the least literature must exist. And for literature to exist, it must be published. Journals must be printed, books must be printed. How can there even be a serious discussion if our journals are handed over for typesetting 2, 3, or even 4 months in advance? You can come to the journal in June and they will tell you that the September issue is finished. The same thing is happening with books. I do not blame the editors who work in publishing houses, but still the fact is that books lie around for 2-3 years! And they lie around because there is nowhere to print them and nothing to print them on. There is nothing to print them on, no printing presses!

If we do not normalize this production process, all our positive discussions will not produce anything useful. And since restructuring is above all a cause, I am making this specific proposal. In our decision we must record that our secretariat should consider this normalization of the literary production process one of the main directions in its work. Otherwise, everything will be empty obligations, an empty industry.

And secondly. Here is something I will never understand. If our publishing houses make so many millions of rubles of profit for the state with the antiquated equipment they have, then why doesn't the state bring this printing equipment up to even normal condition? If the old man Sytin came, millions of rubles would be acquired and all Russia would be satiated with books, not the kind of books that we publish, but interesting books with varied format.

I want to say a few words about young people. On television I saw the speech by V. Karpov, whom I like very much, but nevertheless truth is more precious to me. You are a friend to me but truth is more precious to me. I saw his meeting with the young writers. Comrades gave speeches, comrades with one or two books behind them, and talked about how no one would publish them. And then Vladimir Vasilyevich turns to them and says: "Old chaps, I'm now going to

tell you some very good news. We had a secretariat and some comrades from SOVETSKIY PISATEL came to us and reported on their plan, but we said to them: reduce this plan not by 30 but by 40 positions at the expense of the distinguished and give it all to the young people."

Well, when could metric testimony serve as a pass to literature in Russia? Why, not even knowing yet what books these people would bring, were 30 or 40 plan positions reserved for these young people?

In conclusion, I want to say this. Recently we have been talking among ourselves saying that a crisis has occurred in literature and that people are reading little prose, and poetry even less. I want to say that today I thought: why have people begun to actually read less poetry recently? Is it not as well written, then? No. We have learned to write better than ever! And yet there is almost nothing to read...

I will tell you why. Because technically, in fact, it is solidly put together, but when the idea is dull and unoriginal--it is not interesting to read.

I do not know about you, but I am not ready to drink to this feedback. Where is that printed? It is a poem by Aleksey Parshchikov printed in LITERATURNAYA GAZETA on 11 March.

And here, in my opinion, a very important question arises. I understand that the comrades who printed this will say that we have democracy and we are obliged to print all directions. But it is playing at false democracy. A newspaper is not a post office where you can send whatever you want.

We all want literature to develop in different directions. But what is the difference between man and a parrot? A parrot speaks an enormous number of words and does not respond to anything, but a man responds to everything. He is obliged to respond.

Vikulov on 'Sensational' Journals

Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 6 May 87 pp 5, 6

[Speech by Sergey Vikulov (Moscow)]

[Excerpts] The foundation of restructuring is openness and democracy in their inseparable unity.

Writers have accepted these political categories with particular enthusiasm since real literature does not exist and cannot exist outside the sphere of openness and democracy.

What is openness? Above all it is frankness, it is objective and, hence, uncut information on the true state of affairs in any section of restructuring and, hence, truth, complete truth rather than halftruth, however unpleasant.

However, in leafing through the pages of our journals, both thick ones and thin ones, a person notices that some people understand this openness itself a little differently, that some have turned it entirely to the past and decided that the hour has come to settle accounts (with whom?), blow off the dust from unknown and half-known works, and spill all of it onto the head of the sensation-loving philistine--with no thought at all for the ideological or moral aspect of the very fact of publication nor how much optimism and desire to act it will add or subtract for the person who accepts restructuring with all his heart.

I will immediately make a reservation: I am not against bringing back from nonexistence the artistic treasures of writers whose destinies really took shape dramatically, both in the years of the revolution and after.

This must be done. But must it be done in the pages of journals, especially large editions and mass ones whose sails have traditionally been filled by the winds of the times--the same winds that are breathed by a contemporary standing at a machine tool, cultivating a field, or sending space ships into flight?

Would it not be better to entrust this work to book publishers? I am certain that there would be altogether enough book editions to satisfy the demands of bibliophiles, literary historians, and simply collectors.

To convulsively dig through everything that has been set aside and at times forgotten and even sunk into oblivion for lack of artistic merit (and not at all because it was banned, as some people sometimes try to suggest to uninitiated readers) and to convulsively dig through and publish in mass editions anything whatsoever, shouting--we have restructured!--is truly ridiculous.

For a journal restructuring means bursting into the very thick of the battle which has now begun on the entire front of restructuring and discerning in this battle the heroes and the cowards, and, perhaps, even the deserters, as well as the skeptics and the neutrals who in some episodes of the battle are no better than enemies.

I will not begin to resort to other, stronger comparisons--I will go on. It seems to me that because of our laxness, our long-standing carelessness, and complacency as a national feature and because of distortions of the principles of socialist democracy we proclaim; we, figuratively speaking, find ourselves driven back almost to the Volga line. Many people today understand that we have nowhere further to retreat to--not in the economy nor in the development of science and engineering, nor in culture, nor in the struggle against drunkenness which has reached shameful proportions, nor in the defense of our socialist ethics and morals.

Yes, many people today understand that. Many, but not all. Especially there "in the interior of Russia." But if they do not understand, they continue to live the way they used to live, or rather, the way they became accustomed to and the way they learned to in the previous decades. It was precisely then that the so-called philosophy of these people was formed: "You want to live--

know how to lie," "You scratch my back, I'll scratch yours," "The leaders see more--we are little people," "Work is not a wolf, it does not flee into the forest," and "Only telegraph cylinders do not drink--they are hung upside down."

If you go to the interior or receive a letter from there, you realize with regret and alarm that in reality the forest is now noisy only at the top; below, near the earth itself is deadly silence, the air is motionless, it smells of the rot of all kinds of prohibitions and decrees and, why hide it, our opportunistic works (including ones about how one can and must drink, but in a cultured manner) which have fallen like leaves. Our literary newspaper was especially zealous about that, as you remember; as if we did not know that it is impossible to use narcotics and poison (and that is exactly what alcohol is, as confirmed by the World Health Organization) in a cultured way.

And this is the result: ribs still chatter in lines at vodka stores and if in some places the lines have become shorter it is not because the number of drinkers has dropped--no, the number of buyers has increased: people have learned dozens and hundreds of methods and recipes for making intoxicating swill which in the full sense cuts you down on the spot, fatally.

Have you seen even one television program where the people are told about homebrew as a poison which endangers life, and not only homebrew, but all the various liquids from household goods stores and drugstores that have been drunk up in the last year? No, there are no such programs. We continue to read lying conversations about omnipotent narcologists and LTP's [possibly sobriety-treatment stations] where, it is clear from letters, alcoholics are not treated, but rather rest up from long drinking bouts, and at state expense! The journal NASH SOVREMENNİK, the first to begin the struggle for sobriety as a norm of life long before the well-known decree, even now receives an enormous amount of mail in which the overwhelming majority of letters call for implementation of a "dry law" in the country; in this historic action of the socialist state people not only see the only possibility of saving the nation from physical degeneration but also the fundamental, main condition of our success in restructuring. The truly revolutionary work we began on the 70th anniversary of October can be successfully completed only with a sober head! It was so in 1917, at least!

And there is another feature, a very, very important one, which is related to this work. People say: if the government retreats now in its intention to sober up the people, the authority of any of its decisions and decrees will be undermined for good. But nevertheless, as the readers write, there are already signs of retreat: the sale of vodka is expanding locally under various pretexts and in certain rayons and oblasts the budget remains "drunk." The question arises: why do we writers, assuring the party from the highest forums of our unconditional support for its policies, specifically--the restructuring that has begun, why do we merely smirk ironically when the conversation turns to the struggle against drunkenness? Why don't we come out and talk openly about this pernicious evil, as the courageous--and that above all--Tolstoy did in his later years?!

Why have we not raised a finger to insure that the present generation which is now in school breaks the alcohol tragedy and to indoctrinate this generation to loathe and scorn the vice of their fathers and mothers? Are current school programs pursuing this goal? I very much doubt it.

Incidentally, in 2 months the next all-Union congress of teachers--an event of nationwide importance, will be held.

Our children, our future, are in the hands of the schools! Our ideological enemy is doing everything to insure that our future is not what we planned. And the impression is formed that this enemy is operating more actively than we are and more farsightedly, especially in the area of mass culture. Otherwise, how can it be explained that that enemy and that enemy alone has been acting as the legislator of fashions, especially in recent decades? In music, in style of behavior, in clothes, and in dancing we merely appear in the role of pitiful imitators capable of copying others' faces but incapable of conceiving of and creating our own socialist culture within national traditions.

Vocal-instrumental groups on the Western model with shamelessly affected sexless and voiceless performers take up so much television time that there is barely enough time to congratulate the "has-been's" who at one time betrayed the Motherland and have now come running to her altar again without a shadow of embarrassment on their return.

But what is that to village women--soldiers' widows and mothers who are living out their years in deserted villages distant not only from medical points and hospitals but from kerosene and bread shops as well. Why grieve about them, why delight in their heroism, especially since everyone knows that they will still not start looking for "paradise"?

And in conclusion one more suggestion, but in my opinion a very important one. Remember (and those who do not remember should know from the press): hardly had the war begun when all, almost all, writers put on military uniforms and set off for the front, to particularly important sectors, some as staff associates of the editorial offices of army newspapers, some as special correspondents of central publications.

I propose that our plenum approve an initiative of volunteers--and I am certain they will find them--volunteers to go to oblast newspapers for a month or two and with their written word help them, as M.S. Gorbachev said, further the restructuring, move it ahead, and there, locally, penetrate to the essence of the most acute conflict situations which demand immediate solutions, write about them, and then make what they have written the property of the all-Union reader through journals. That, for a start, will be our specific help to the party in implementing restructuring! At the present time such activism is usually seen among writers from outlying areas. NASH SOVREMENNİK has published and continues publishing in its regular issues the brilliant, profound articles of Ivan Vasilyev, Ivan Sinitsyn, and Vladimir Kuropatov. I ask you to remember that name--Vladimir Kuropatov from Kemerovo.

Estonia's Beekman on Phosphor Mines

Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 6 May 87 p 6

[Speech by Vladimir Beekman (Estonia)]

[Text] I would like to begin with some very commonplace things related in one way or another to literature, the present, and restructuring, with a small digression to the theme of my speech at the 8th congress, since I was the only one who dared pose the question of creating an independent creative union of translators, after which I was bombarded, and on an all-Union scale. It seemed to our translator colleagues that we wanted to separate them from the creative union. But the contrary was intended. Many translators expressed grievances after the congress that nothing was said there about their difficult, truly creative labor. Nothing was said. And it applies at our plenum too--you cannot embrace the unembraceable.

In Bulgaria when the translators union was set up, many people were against it; but now they fervently support their creative union--it was the first to take up the creative, and not only the creative, problems of translators, and in material terms it is able to offer stipends and on-the-job training abroad such as our ordinary untitled translators can only dream of. Therefore it is too early to close this question, and such a decision would also be a blessing for our union, which has spread to amorphousness.

Yesterday I was walking around Moscow and suddenly a fine fellow in steelworker clothing was looking at me from a poster and asking menacingly, in big letters: "Are you already working in the new way?" It made me feel uneasy, as if I was guilty of something. This is how someone is trying to make his contribution to restructuring using the "esthetics" of many years standing: the checkmark is made, the poster printed and hung. This, in my opinion, is offensive to a real worker. And you will not force a loafer to work with this poster.

We in the Writers' Union of Estonia are not creating illusions that we have progressed a long way on the path of restructuring. The books which have come out so far were written at least 2 years ago, and the books which will reflect the civic position of today's writer are only approaching. However, fairly significant changes have occurred in our union in the year since the congress. I would say that the civic activism of literary figures has risen decisively, above all the civic activism of the really good and most well-known writers who have been very actively included in solving not narrow literary but general problems such as the problem of urban construction--masses of housing units surround Tallinn on all sides. The commission to rename streets in Tallin and in Tartu is working to restore the old names to them.

Yearly meetings have been going on in our union for a long time. We think it is not enough to assemble our collective once every 5 years and we therefore meet every year. But until recently we have used this opportunity somewhat formalistically and allowed ourselves to load the agenda of the yearly meeting with such a multitude of questions that after discussing them there was no time to take any action.

Last time we reduced the agenda by one-half and offered the rostrum to all who wanted it, since there is no better method for democratizing a writers' organization than a concerned exchange of opinions; we were rewarded for it. The meeting was held with great enthusiasm. Incidentally, one regional problem arose there which was no less important than the problem of building embankments for Leningrad... It was the question of possibly working the phosphorous deposits in northeast Estonia. We immediately appealed to specialists of the Academy of Sciences, scientists, and the general public. Public opinion supported us. It was explained that permission was given, on an exception basis, to plan exploitation, even to the point of establishing the volume of the deposit's reserves. However, the ecological consequences, if development were begun without proper technology, could be dangerous to our part of Estonia, since the point is saving the sources of our small rivers. We took a petition to the party Central Committee and the Council of Ministers and protocols have now been signed on the further development of technology and on research that precludes a rash opening up of the land. We think that we have done a good thing, since it will promote a better future for our region.

Such initiatives have brought about a change in the last year in how the Writers' Union is seen by the public, as a public organization not a narrowly professional one.

The question of whether it would be correct to make the posts of chief editors of our press organs elective also arose at the presidium of the governing board. If we in the governing board elect a chairman and secretary, we can most likely choose and periodically reelect editors so that there are no lifelong posts.

Mushketik on Lack of Ukrainian Schools

Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 6 May 87 p 6

[Speech by Yuriy Mushketik (Ukraine)]

[Excerpt] A writer cannot write without faith. Recently I met with participants in an interblast literary seminar and saw that they read very little in general and almost nothing from contemporary Soviet literature: well, what are we supposed to read, they say, everything is rubbish.

I became alarmed both at these words and at the fact that we could not find anything worthwhile among the completely literate manuscripts of these young people. How could we speak of wit there? It was all just spirals and designs of complex metaphors. That is where we should direct our efforts first of all. For us it is restructuring, for young people it is new construction.

And I want to say more about faith. It is based 99 percent on personal example. If you point to Capricorn your whole life and say that it is Aquarius, no one will believe such an astrologer. And if in fighting for the purity of customs we poison our writers' atmosphere with personal quarrels and if in struggling for ecology and for preserving bird and wild animal species

which are dying off we carry on battle "within the [human] species," it is very damaging to our common cause. We are now writing a great deal in our works about such categories as kindness, conscientiousness, and the ability to forgive. But let us apply them to ourselves. Where are we to seek support? Some writers have begun persistently repeating the literary prayer of the end of the last century: "Beauty will save the world." I want to ask: where have you seen it multiplying? Show us.

Others call for seeking new artistic forms in order to eradicate evil and reflect life in a full-blooded way. The terms "supernovel" [superroman] and "metanovel" [sverkhroman] have appeared. But does it not seem that it is much more fruitful to move toward simple realism, toward the truth which has begun to take its proper place in social life?

The party has given us faith. We find it in those changes which are occurring in the country. We are confirmed in the consciousness that restructuring is selecting everything good that has been done in the long years as well as creating new values without glossed-over touches and shells of lies. The fresh wind of changes has affected all spheres of our life, literature in particular. I am speaking of our republic's experience. The restructuring of management and the publishing-editorial apparatus has begun, though slowly and not at the rate we would like, and certain changes in sociopolitical commentary and novel writing can be sensed. For the first time in many years we have looked more deeply into the needs and troubles of a number of oblast writers' organizations; we are strengthening our international ties--among other things, writers who write in other languages were heard at the meeting of the secretariat.

The Days of Soviet Literature, a real festival of the brotherhood and friendship of peoples, were literally just held. But I would be acting against my conscience if I concealed from this all-Union writers' meeting one aspect of this problem which today bothers Ukrainian writers very much and which M. Alekseyev, N. Gilevich, B. Oleynik, and S. Zalygin have already talked about.

The school charter, old and new, which is now being discussed in the country and is the basis of the law on education, by one of its points allows parents to choose the school with its language of instruction for their children (within the republic). In schools where Russian is the language of instruction we now very often see this picture: let us say, of 30 children 18 in the class study the Ukrainian language and 12 do not; in class, at best, they play naval combat and chess and make jokes about those who "cram" to learn a language. Draw the conclusions yourselves. In general the fair but not completely precise and developed position on parents' right to choose the school with the language of instruction has in practice resulted in the following: not one school in the Ukrainian language remains in my native Chernigov, for example, a place where during my youth most schools were Ukrainian schools, as they were in many other cities of the republic. Maybe one or two remain. This, of course, does not at all help to expand and consolidate internationalist trends. These are the trends which have caused Soviet people unite into a unified, amicable family. Together we decide the questions which the present and the future pose for us and we are enriched by

historical experience and the experience of socialist construction. But let us together think about this problem too. The USSR Writers' Union and its press organs should include questions of the development of national literatures and languages in their orbit more often and in greater volume and not put them aside as secondary.

Among the people it is said: it is difficult to reap when there is nothing to sow. Now for various reasons the Ukrainian Writers' Union has reached the point where there is nothing to sow and its material-technical base has collapsed. Two of our Houses of Creativity are just piles of brick. We have no House of Writers, there is no hall, and the library is in terrible condition. The CPSU Central Committee and Council of Ministers decree which speaks of strengthening the material-technical base of creative unions is very relevant, but we are not on the list and we now have no prospects and hopes. The leadership of the USSR Writers' Union knows about our misfortunes, so I am asking for assistance and aid.

And one more thing, on a cautionary note. I once happened to be present at an organization where at the start of the meeting all of its participants were given pieces of paper and by the end each was supposed to write what he had already restructured and sign it. It seems the best initiative can be reduced to formalism. Let us always remember that real restructuring is oriented to the dream, to the idea, a constructive and creative process which comes from the depths of the heart--and creativity is a guarantee of the success of any good cause.

Kaipbergenov on Aral Catastrophe

Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 6 May 87 p 6

[Speech by Tulepbergen Kaipbergenov (Karakalpakiya)]

[Text] Comrades, I want to tell you about problems which at first glance are far from literature. Everyone knows that many disasters involving water are being rectified, and writers are playing a part here. But in our area these disasters remain unrectified and we are talking about the life and death of hundreds of thousands and millions of our contemporaries--citizens of the USSR--and about the future of our progeny. They are the problems of improving the land of Soviet Central Asia and--one of the most important of them--saving the Aral Sea, the main object that protects our lands from the encroachment of the vast Asian deserts--the Kyzylkumy and Karakumy.

Specifically, several days ago we had the first meeting of the government commission on problems of the Aral in Nukus. Angry, unpleasant debates went on there. I saw with my own eyes that the opponents of protecting the Aral not only exist but are persisting. I therefore want to cite some facts and considerations.

The recent history of the Aral represents the sad result of the impact of the "transformer" on the environment. Mankind has not known a case where a sea with a water area of more than 6 million hectares and a depth of up to 69 meters would disappear from the face of the earth in a quarter of a century

before the eyes of one generation of people. Today the sea has already dried up by almost half.

The Amu Darya and the Syr Darya have not flowed to the sea for several years now. But on geographic and other maps everything remains the same as it was 30 years ago. Habit is obviously at work: if things are okay on paper, then they are okay in fact. We are all afraid and ashamed to show what we have "accomplished"... Even though even the sea ports of Muynak and Aralsk have long been surrounded by nothing but sand dunes for many kilometers.

That is the reality. The situation is aggravated by the fact that it is precisely here that the negative results of man's economic activity throughout the Amu Darya basin are focused. Drinking water contains enormous doses of pesticides, the residue of fertilizers, and all possible types of salt. According to scientists' data, if the average norm of fertilizers amounts to 30 kilograms per hectare throughout the country, in Central Asia it reaches 480-600 kilograms and of toxic chemicals--1-2 kilograms and 34.4 kilograms, respectively.

In recent years hundreds of thousands of hectares of vegetation-covered bottom land and reed thickets in the delta have dried up and many types of animals, birds, and fish are disappearing. The prospects are most dismal--ecological disaster.

Today it is already obvious that without emergency state measures it will be impossible for the population in a large part of the region to survive, and they are already leaving.

Whoever has been in the lower reaches of the Amu Darya, of course, has admired the numerous archeological monuments. An entire region of ours is called Ellik-kala (50 fortresses) and more than 200 archeological monuments are located on its territory. Historians state that several centuries ago, in connection with punitive measures by Gengis Khan and later Tamerlane, the Amu Darya was directed along an ancient channel toward the Caspian. Naturally, the level of the Aral Sea was sharply reduced and climatic and water conditions changed. The population completely abandoned their homes and cities, their land and their homeland.

But the menacing warning was not understood. The hoary Aral endured the onslaught of people for a long time. Until 1960 the water level was relatively stable. We should have stopped in time. But the attack continued and more and more new lands were developed.

While with universal tacit approval economists went about their work with an enormous fanfare of ceremonial reports, scientists studied the problems for dozens of years. They gathered behind the closed doors of symposiums, seminars, and conferences. It is true that some medal-bedecked economic managers were also invited. Half-hearted recommendations and decisions were adopted, but they have not been fulfilled. Even though some people were aware that each day lost was inexorably, like fate, hastening the outcome. Winter became colder and summer shorter and hotter. They understood that the

consequences of the catastrophe for the fauna and flora of the Aral Region and for all of Central Asia and the world climate were unpredictable.

Each such conference was more like a meeting of the commission to organize the burial of a sick person at his deathbed than a doctors' consultation. Essentially it was a matter of covering the mortal remains in the sand without too much noise and in a little more seemly manner so that their consciences would not torment them.

Today the question is truly a Hamlet-like one: are people to live or not to live on the land of their ancestors? And how did it happen that the 57th Article of the country's Constitution where it is written--"USSR citizens have the right to legal protection from encroachments on... life and health... "-- did not protect the inhabitants?

But who is to go to court? The former managers of the Darya region oblasts? who are mostly now being criminally charged with accepting bribes and embezzlement of public funds? Or the main land improver and water distributor--the USSR Ministry of Land Reclamation and Water Resources? This is how the ministry's enterprising and energetic administrators took our misfortune to heart--they suggested that, if we could find the means, they would allocate and set up small water purification plants. They promised us almost the entire first industrial batch of 150 units... And they know the statistics well. The impressive achievements expressed in millions of tons and billions of our and your capital investments, in enormous blocks of new lands. In the last resort they take refuge in the tested and invincible shield: words about our Homeland's honor as a cotton grower and our independence in growing rice. What writer can shout down a whole harmonious choir? Who can beat them in an argument? It is as if we have forgotten that the main function of the enormous reservoir among the sands is to serve as a natural solar receiver. Salts accumulated over several centuries are exposed as a result of the drying up of the sea. According to scientists' estimates, every year the wind in the Aral Region brings up to 75 million tons of salt; that would fill a train approximately 12,000 kilometers long. In recent years the wind has scattered about 1 billion tons of salt, a hypothetical train the length of four and one-half equators, over the territory of the Karakalpakiya and the northern rayons of Turkmenia. Salt waste accelerates the degradation of the unique natural environment of the Southern Aral Region like an avalanche.

Recently the journal KOMMUNIST wrote: "The history of human civilization knows quite a few instructive examples of how wasteful economic activity causes irreversible destructive processes in nature. The now sadly well-known region of the present Sahara was at one time an intensive farming zone. People who tried to get their daily bread there acted against natural laws, judging from everything, and they paid cruelly for it. The same thing can be said about the deserts of Asia."

The wise words of the great Russian scientist-naturalist that mastery of the land is not only a right or a privilege but a heavy commitment which threatens accountability before the court of posterity complements this quote.

Our descendants are being born today. And they are dying today. Nothing can justify even the smallest drop of a child's bitter tears, of a child's life unlived.

To no small degree the impending disaster is not a defeat by the blind elements, but the fruit of man's criminal negligence and overconfidence. Saving the Aral today and preserving conditions for normal life is a question of the reputation of the socialist system and it is a question of our future.

I am appealing to the precious experience of our society, the experience of writers who have passionately fought for the purity of Baikal and Ladoga, for the culture of ecology, and for the harmony of Man and Nature.

The bewildered eyes of the peasant who stands in the hot sun in a shirt white with the salt of sweat in the middle of a field that is white with salt. In my opinion, this is the most pressing topic for our contemporary literature and writers.

Scientists love to specify: the Aral is a sea-lake. But for us residents of the South Aral Region, the Aral is a sea. Our sea. And the Amu Darya is our river. A substantial part of the folklore and an enormous multitude of traditions, legends, fairy tales, proverbs, sayings, riddles, and tales involve the Aral, the Amu Darya, and the Syr Darya. But will they be understood by future generations? That is the question today.

Amlinskiy on Komsomol's 'Nylon Boys'

Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 6 May 87 pp 6, 7

[Speech by Vladimir Amlinskiy (Moscow)]

[Text] A great deal has been said here about ecology. About the destruction, annihilation, and ruin of nature. But it is also important to talk about the ecology of the spirit and culture... They are also in danger. They also require protection, attention, and understanding. It is no accident that people at the plenum have begun talking about young people and about the new generation: rock and rollers, heavy metallists, the Lyubertsy and about all these informal associations, about the impending danger for us that our young people will be alienated from the genuine culture bequeathed by the centuries... There is a great deal to worry about here, a great deal that causes bewilderment, misunderstanding, and protest. But one old philosopher said: "Do not cry, do not laugh, just understand." And before we judge the strange young person who repulses adults by his exotic clothes and deafens them with his metallic rhythms, we must understand who he is and how he got that way and comprehend him as a sociopsychological type. We must comprehend the reasons for the appearance of this sociopsychological type.

The "epoch of stagnation"--this is a short, code-like definition.

However paradoxical it is, such a time is not always a bad one for literature since social stagnation produces pain and sharpness of perception and discord,

and many profound and serious books were written precisely in that period, although they came out much later (as it was in the past, so it is now).

But nonetheless this time is by no means the best one for contemporaries and for people, especially young people, since young people are simultaneously the most active and most vulnerable part of society. The discrepancy between word and deed has turned into a huge, sticky swamp in which many people have drowned.

Literature must relentlessly and at the same time with a lofty humane outlook comprehend and express the most difficult phenomena, since what is not fully spoken of and uncovered remains an infection in the living body of society.

People worked and worked till they were worn out, a great deal was done, but always there was something nearby that created a feeling of some kind of dangerous parody. And when we traveled along the roads of our country, we saw how the slogans with messages such as "The economy must be economical" (what news!), "Feed, feed, and again feed!", and "Quality is the Road to the Five-Year Plan"--were covered with dust. But quality did not improve because of the posters. These are tragicomic examples of the times, and they revealed dangerous, destructive ever-growing corrosion. Naturally, this did not help either real searching or the spirit of creativity... And it put pressure on all of us, but especially on the young people. The adults were hardened but the young people, who had not yet experienced the world and the delights of life, were poised on the brink of losing faith, suffering disappointment and, at times, a feeling of hopelessness. That is the reason they looked for other values, in the most varied places--from Buddhism to yoga.

Incidentally, atheistic articles which periodically appear among us do not promote anything good since they are written in the vulgar-sociological spirit of the journal BEZBOZHNIK of the 1920's-1930's. Sometimes they attack writers--writers who have dealt with the theme of spiritual quests; but the writers stand their ground and so these articles do not teach young people anything. It is not a struggle for new consciousness or the ability to interpret the world scientifically or a struggle for individuality but merely hackneyed cliches which bring a bitter taste.

The vacillations of the young are varied. There are those characteristic of their age which on the whole pass quickly, but there are also defiant ones. And this must be said. It is terrible to imagine that in a country which lost millions and millions of people in the war, all of a sudden such a group of young creatures in black and brown shirts (they used to meet on Pushkin Square, now they choose more secluded places) greet one another with exclamations in the spirit of prewar and war-time Nuremberg.

But who are they? Neofascists? No, of course not. Ugly, malicious milksops, confused people. Although, of course, they can grow into cruel, dangerous people. But at present this is a manifestation of deliberately shocking behavior. Harmful shocking behavior. It is not yet, of course, an ideology--but it is a challenge and it must be taken up.

In recent years the Komsomol has lived its life apart from young people. It has become a formal association and dozens of informal associations have arisen around it. It is good that new, anxious, sharp notes sounded at the 20th Komsomol Congress... All this bodes changes.

I remember the Komsomol of the 1950's. It was different. It was the Komsomol of the virgin lands. People devoted themselves to the cause with passion... Sometimes the youthful impulse was exploited by careless managers. But, nonetheless, that generation sensed that it was essential in the social process and did its work honestly.

But even then a new type of Komosomol worker had begun to appear. Then he became stronger. I call them the "nylon boys." With their bureaucratic manner of using official jargon ("arises from such-and-such" and "to resolve the question"). The trouble is that they did not resolve any questions.

The adult, middle-aged bureaucratic type is unpleasant. But the young bureaucrat type is especially disgusting.

All this repulsed both the Komsomol and sometimes the society. Alienation, a desire to pit one's small world against the hypocrisy of this world. This process was complex and we must again and again try to figure it out so that it is not repeated and so that we feel that being young is not only difficult but also interesting and good.

I recently reread a book written in the 1950's about Moscow. In it artists, poets, prose writers, scientists, and architects, rejoice in the demolition of the Sukharevaya Tower and the Christ the Savior Cathedral as a victory. It said that even the Kremlin was lost like a golden toy among the skyscrapers. Later these same people at another time protected and rescued culture, having realized that earlier they had been fatefully confused. However, we have not assimilated the historical experience of such mistakes as we should have.

I have written about the fate of the Angleterre Hotel and the fact that Yesenin's last refuge in life became a passage yard. The room from which he saw for the last time the golden glow of St. Isaac's, the winter sky, and life. The tragic parts of an artist's life also belong to history and are also protected. But now the Angleterre has been completely destroyed and knocked down and that room has been lost in the rubble forever.

The fate of the Tretyakov Gallery, which has been taken out of the cultural life of Moscow and the country for years, is also disturbing. What will it be like after the restoration--will it be the way Tretyakov built it for Russia?

And when young people try to save the Angleterre Hotel and come out to the square, it is a sign of self-consciousness rather than hooliganism, as some people have tried to say.

You cannot bring destroyed monuments back but books do not die and the return of many names to our literature is a cause of great justice. Often rejected unfairly and sometimes destroyed, they have again found a voice for everyone, and not just those who read Gumilev in secret.

They are various kinds of works. But Akhmatova's "Requiem" is in any case not a literary monument.

There are people who want to classify these writers' works as literary monuments. No, it is a long poem of the greatest bitterness and at the same time a human document. Just like the works of A. Platonov, B. Pasternak, and V. Shalamov which were not published during their lifetimes. And even V. Nabokov's works should not be classified as a monument--his great talent is in itself a powerful manifestation of life... There are monuments of literature of those years. But even they need protection.

That is essential. Injustice against them is injustice against us and against our culture. And they occupy their own place, which history has assigned to them, rather than someone else's... Generally all mistakes have to be paid for, and the price is high.

The process of spiritual renewal and liberation from confusion and cliches is not at all simple; it requires courage, consistency, and faith.

Bondarev on National Pride

Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 6 May 87 p 7

[Speech by Yuriy Bondarev (Moscow)]

[Text] It may be that recently we have in fact been talking a great deal and writing very little. But I would still like to say something very briefly about one major question which almost everyone who has spoken has dealt with. If we do not now express our attitude toward this problem and all our efforts (God forgive) lead to separation, it will be a great tragedy--human brotherhood will not commence.

Russians are renowned for their kindness, breadth, and charity. But there is good and bad in every country. The polar forces, however, have never won a final victory, they have only constrained one another.

Nationalism must not be fought with methods of nationalism, since that engenders the most evil passions and the lowest instincts. "By birth I am a Russian but in faith and ideas I am a Greek." Those words belong to the Patriarch Nikon, who divided old Russia with lies, literalism, and dislike for his own people.

"I am Russian and I am proud of it." "I am Ukrainian and I am proud of it." "I am a Georgian and I am proud of it." This is noble love for the native home and for our forefathers and mothers who gave birth to us, nourished us, and raised us.

If I say that our Russian people are almost the most intelligent and talented people, there is no humiliation or insult to another nationality in it. A representative of the Armenian people, for example, can say the same words about his people, and there is nothing insulting to a Russian or an Uzbek.

The people are always with us but we are not always and not in everything with our own long-suffering people.

In the 19th century theologians and philosophers said that the American, Jewish, and Russian peoples were chosen by God. But who has God chosen now and for what precisely were they chosen?

I am deeply convinced that every people has its own destiny.

All nations require self-affirmation rather than self-humiliation.

Dementyev on Afghan Soldiers

Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 6 May 87 pp 8, 9

[Speech by Andrey Dementyev (Moscow)]

[Excerpts] I want you to understand me correctly; I do not want to diminish the significance of our union and our secretariat, but I still think that the center of literary life has now moved to the journals. And this is natural, since journals today are undergoing restructuring, they have gotten closer to the reader and more penetrating, and those problems of life which now disturb all of us in one way or another find their way to the pages of journals. The point is also that it is precisely in journals that the fate of manuscripts and the fate of writers are decided, since they are inseparably related. I will cite only one example, Yu. Polyakov. After he began to be published with us as a poet, he brought us the story "ChP rayonnogo masshtaba" [An Extraordinary Event of Rayon Proportions]. We spent 2 years trying to get it through. This was still before restructuring and the 2 years were hard for us since in this story the young writer, who knew the Komsomol not by hearsay but from working as a raykom instructor, for the first time revealed the negative phenomena in the Komsomol and talked about the bureaucratism which has still not been eliminated there. Yu. Polyakov received the Lenin Komsomol prize for this work. We gave him a special order--write about school. Yu. Polyakov went to school and worked there as a teacher. We also printed this story. It is called "Rabota nad oshibkami" [Working on Mistakes]. He has now brought something new. I think a difficult destiny awaits it too, since it is devoted to nonregulation relations in the army. But it seems to me that young people should probably work that way; they should also feel the support of their elder comrades. Imagine if YUNOST had not printed "ChP..." at that time but had printed it after the 27th Party Congress and after the 20th Komsomol Congress--how would the destiny of that writer have taken shape? Differently, I think. He would have gone after events rather than before them.

And now I want to talk about the problem of youth in general. Today we have already talked about that, and we talked about it a lot yesterday. I very much understand Sergeyev's concern. But his approach to the problem of young people was not entirely correct. They are very different. Why did informal associations appear? Because the Komsomol overlooked many things, because youth is above all romance and mystery, but we tried to bureaucratize the relations of young people. We tried to squeeze their unpredictability and

their right to search into confines, into schedules, decrees, and various kinds of protocols. So the youth responded with informal associations and said that they wanted independence. Not so long ago we invited representatives of the informal associations to the editorial office. We had a candid talk with them for several hours. I will tell you who was there-- "people from Lyubertsy," "Lyubera," as they call themselves, Beatlemen, hippies, heavy metallists, "Bulgakovites," the "Pamyat" organization, and breakdancers. The guys were all kinds. We spent several hours with them and tried to understand what kind of people they were. Are their clothing and ornaments really their true essence. Is it a worldview or some trinkets which they want to use to distinguish themselves from one another?

I talked with one of them, a young hippie fellow. He is a lathe operator, and married. I asked him: "How much do you get?" He answered: "I used to earn 240 rubles." "And now?" "And now--half as much." "Why?" "Because I'm a hippie, and our leaders are trying to reeducate me using material measures."

Recently a group of Soviet writers met with Mr. Schultz, the U.S. Secretary of State. This talk lasted for 2 hours. He asked us--the six writers involved in the conversation--only one question: "How do you understand openness?" And we answered him truthfully.

Restructuring and openness are now changing even the international climate--you sense this in the newspapers. It helps us to reach agreement. It was probably for that reason that Mr. Schultz listened to each writer with such interest. Propaganda in the United States is now in confusion--all their malicious attacks against us are nothing in comparison to the serious conversation which is going on in our country and in comparison with the restructuring which we are now undergoing. And literature is not in last place here.

I would also like to say that our responsibility to young writers and simply to youth is enormous.

I will cite merely one example. Not so long ago small posters appeared with photographs of Heroes of the Soviet Union who won this title by performing their international duty in Afghanistan. In this group were young people who received the high title posthumously. Among them was Kolya Anfinogenov. He was 20 years old. I wrote a poem about him and his photograph is in my home. He died by blowing himself up with a grenade rather than surrender to the Dushmans.

Recently we in the editorial office decided to do an interview with a young man who was also 20 years old. It was only because of his age that he did not receive the "supreme punishment" for everything he had done against our society. Society rejected him. They gave him a long prison term. What a range there is: two different people, both of them 20 years old, both studied in our schools and probably read the same books, and lived in our Soviet conditions. But one is a hero and the other a criminal... And when I think of who is to blame, I believe that we too are guilty, of course. We must always remember that a person is always unique. And this person, especially a

young one, is always an entire world, at times unsteady, which we must understand and which we must at least treat with tolerance.

I must say something more. Our journals are now frequently out of touch with one another. It seems to me that creating a council of chief editors of the literary-artistic journals of the USSR Writers' Union makes sense--I have already talked about this. We must be closer to one another and we must advise and understand one another more. I do not want to answer S. Kunyayev now, but I will say: do not confront us, do not make YUNOST something it is not. We must understand one another and deal with each other more tolerantly.

Krupin on River Diversion

Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 6 May 87 p 8

[Speech by Vladimir Krupin (Moscow)]

[Excerpt] Long ago we discussed the question and talked of publishing "Istoriya gosudarstva Rossiyskogo" [The History of the Russian State] by Karamzin. It is a blow against youth to cut them off--from the graves, from history. We say: why not publish this? The usual excuse: no paper. In 1981 at a meeting with the State Committee for Publishing Houses, Printing Plants, and the Book Trade V. Pasputin said: "I don't know about my comrades, but I renounce my own publications in favor of Karamzin..." Belov, Zalygin, Likhonosov, Lichutin, Astafyev, and Potanin were there--whomever I did not name, forgive me, please. We all renounced our publications in favor of Karamzin.

Today people have told me that the question of publishing Karamzin is again being pushed aside; supposedly some commentaries are needed. And that is another 10 years. It was decided to hand the question over to the "Nauka" Publishing House. Let them publish it with commentaries, that is fine. But, comrades, why not publish in facsimile; after all, they did a fine job of publishing "Kolokol" [The Bell] by Hertzen and other such literature. Let us figure it out somehow! After all, we are examining the enemies of Soviet power in publications.

In general the question of the "Nauka" Publishing House becomes a question of our scientists. As the chairman of a commission on nature preservation I must say that we have recently begun to recall the names of Vernadskiy, Chizhevskiy, Mendeleyev, Vavilov, Dokuchayev, Pavlov... Why? Because in this way we express our reproach of modern scientists who can hastily service any idea sent down to them. This also applies to writers. The question of diverting rivers to the south is being whipped up in the agroindustrial committee again. The same supporters of diversion are in the committee's groups--water, economic, and ecological. I am again running across the names Zhavoronkov, Voropayev, Vasilyev, Izrael, Poladzade. Here is a list of the water management work which is planned in the 12th Five-Year Plan period--and monstrous things are included in it! Volga--Chogray, Volga--Ural, Dunay--Dnepr. When we begin to protest, they tell us: well, all you are giving us is emotions.

What kind of emotions?!

When we built Dneprogas, only the economic aspect was taken into account, but when we built the Kuybyshev GES, for example, we were already taking the ecological side into account. Then, when we built the Cheboksaray GES it seemed to be taken into account. But why is that emotions? When they began to flood the monuments to the history of the Fatherland and to flood the graves, was it really just emotions then? That is our life, our history.

Now please, take the Rzhev Reservoir. And again the question arises of openness. But again there is nothing to say. The Northwest Front--the bloodiest front of the war passed through there--soldiers are not given to telling lies. And it was no accident that Tvardovskiy wrote "Ya ubit podo Rzhevom" [I was killed near Rzhev]. That is the Rzhev Reservoir... In the plan we read: "some soldiers' burial sites are being submerged..." The phrase in itself is monstrous! What is a soldiers' burial site? I was at the fraternal Poluninskiy Grave where 10,000 people are buried, and as one old man said: "They were not killed--they died for the Motherland!"

Incidentally, the Rzhev Reservoir would not be needed at all if Moscow conserved even one-third of the water that flows past.

Why has our commission stopped working lately? We have in fact been prohibited from working. Before we were given a large hall in the Central House of Writers, and people even stood in the corridors for 4-5 hours and in March we were given a small hall, in April we were banned, and in May--we were also banned. Why? Because at one of our meetings when a very serious question on nature in Moscow had been raised, I think the bosses did not like one speech. But after all, more than 30 people spoke. Then they told us that we were "stirring the situation up under the guise of restructuring." In all more than 200 people spoke at the commission's meetings. Sometimes it still seems to me that the Moscow Writers' Organization is living in the attic of the House of Writers, and even that is just out of charity, and the House of Writers goes its own way.

Now I want to talk about the unhealthy situation in the writers' organizations, which A. Pletnev talked about. It is not just in Omsk. For example, it is very complicated in Krasnodar, in Gorno-Altaysk, and in many other places. I was just in Magadan--there eight people managed to divide up into three factions. What is there to divide?

Poptsov Discusses Criticism

Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 6 May 87 p 8

[Speech by Oleg Poptsov (Moscow)]

[Excerpts] Our reports at plenums are as a rule a statement of the obvious mixed with political rhetoric. Analysis of deep-seated literary processes, not to speak of public and social processes, is simply lacking. Either we do not see or we do not know how. Neither one enhances the prestige of our literary union. So many angry words have been said about literary criticism!

It is complimentary, it is superficial, it is expedient. But in its reports the Writers' Union has not said the main thing even once: why? It has not said that for decades the powerful and many-headed stratum of literary criticism has existed on the principle of a kind of welfare system where the guiding factor in the critic's creative work was not literary interest but rather commercial interest. They wrote about people who could exercise influence, give support, get things through, put in a good word, and get a book into the plan. Who could enjoy, if not literary, then at least administrative authority. However, it would be unfair to say that all our critics behaved in that way. Of course not. And again the reproaches against the best critical pens--Zolotusskiy, Turbin, Lakshin, Lobanov, Chalmayev, Vinogradov, and Karyakin--that they had supposedly disdained the contemporary literary process and went off into the study of literature were not just unfair, they were another type of lie. They went off into the study of literature because they did not want to adapt themselves and betray their own faith. And it is certainly true that they simply were not published. They were uncontrollable and hence not needed. This passion for subservience, for controllability, will ultimately destroy us. It is a hundred times more moral to say again that Gogol is great than to extol what does not exist and render praise to a contemporary primitive.

As a result at least 3 generations of writers who entered literature in the last 15 years have been left with no literary criticism. It was simply not profitable to write about them. They did not hold any administrative stock in the literary or administrative Olympus. But the whole mechanism of internal literary relations has worked on this basis only for many years. And as a result our reading society has a distorted idea of the modern literary process. By the way, the political apparatus, too. With what enraptured "froth" we tried to dispel the allegation that a group struggle was occurring in our literature; those who spoke of this aloud were immediately registered in the camp of people working to split the union. The present plenum is the first one where this has been spoken of aloud in the report of the governing board of the Writers' Union. And that is principled and important.

After turning a page of history, it is impossible to promptly forget it. Especially since past social structures continue to function in the old way for a long time in the present day.

That is why restructuring is so difficult. Using common sense we can say that our domestic culture has entered a long period of interpretation of the last 20-25 years. That means we can expect major literary revelations devoted to precisely this time--revelations that penetrate to the depth of the causes of stagnation, deformation, and regeneration rather than glide over the surface. And it depends entirely on us whether we will be able to overcome the habit of forgetting, not seeing, and not hearing.

Mozhayev on Opposition to Change

Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 6 May 87 p 8

[Speech by Boris Mozhayev (Moscow)]

[Excerpt] This is the second day I have been sitting here listening to the fiery speeches of our comrades and thinking: no, everything has already been said about literature, I think I will try to talk a little about life, about what our society and country live by and how. What questions do we face? What has restructuring provided? Why is it spinning its wheels?

But... an old habit still stretches toward literature. No, I think, even just one writer, but he must be mentioned. His name is Saltykov-Shchedrin.

Do you know why the peasant in his story fed two generals on an uninhabited island? Because the generals demanded that the peasant get them food; but they did not say how to get it--the peasant himself knew how to do it. He was given complete independence. The peasant got the food, the generals ate, drank, played cards, and swore at each other.

The current generals (I mean civilian generals) do not drink, at least publicly, do not play cards, and speak very politely and instruct everyone: just drop by there, pick up such-and-such, bring it with you, put it there, move it there, and so on and so forth.

We finally noticed this strange paradox which has existed for a long time. We noticed and we proclaimed restructuring. Restructuring is a national cause. We introduced openness. Thank you. Openness is an indispensable condition for restructuring. It is openness which has changed, strikingly changed, our newspapers and journals; they have become interesting to read. Many marvelous social-commentary works have appeared, even good artistic works, rarely but they do occur.

But independence above all.

The resolutions adopted on this account are very serious, very. The job is to carry them out. But... many people took it literally: since the resolution has been adopted and signed, the responsibility is off my shoulders. What is there to say about that--everyone surely knows that you carry out what has been written.

In fact everything is not so simple.

I have lived in Moscow for just 3-4 months of the last 2 years; the rest of the time I was in the provinces, as was said earlier. I was in the Far East for 2 months, in Latvia for several months, and in Ryazan, Novgorod, and Kalinin oblasts, in the Stavropol region, and in Rostov Oblast.

I have found many experienced managers and intelligent people who are deserving and know their work splendidly. Not one of them (I mean farm managers) is independent in the full sense.

I want to cite several cases for you.

Although at one of the meetings a certain writer, who is now sitting not far from me right now, said that there is the truth of a fact and there is the truth of truth. What he meant by that, he simply did not explain.

But, let us turn to the facts.

A couple of weeks ago it was announced on television that Volgograd Oblast was well prepared for planting, that the machines had all been repaired, and that everything was in order--they were awaiting the start of planting.

But here was the problem--40 percent of the seeds delivered to the farms by the Ministry of Grain Products were unfit. But how did it happen that the independent farms did not keep seeds for themselves? Do they not understand then? Everyone understands. Whoever was in the fields last fall saw how the "first commandment" declared a little more than 50 years ago was fulfilled by us. The commandment "The first grain goes to the state" quickly became "All grain goes to the state." I saw an enormous quantity of grain lying out under the open sky: it burned up, sprouted, and clouds of crows grazed on it. Grain was piled up right in swamps in the fields and at railway stations. That is how the "first commandment" is fulfilled.

And a new phrase has appeared--grain storage piles. Look in any dictionary, you will not find anything like it. Root crops, beets, and potatoes were kept in storage piles but grain was collected in granaries, bins, and hoppers. And now it is under the open sky. So then, do we have poor bosses? Do they not understand what they are doing? Everyone understands completely.

And, after all, the objective was to provide the mandatory deliveries and distribute the rest to themselves. But the execution? The execution was something else--they sometimes turned over everything down to the last grain! That is how it came about that not just Volgograd Oblast was left without seeds. We report how much grain we procured, but we do not write down how much we have lost.

Under the present food requisitioning system independence does not cost anything. Food requisitioning and independence are two incompatible things, like a genius and crime, as Pushkin said.

Here is another fresh example. A milkmaid spoke at the All-Union Komsomol congress, spoke well, and said: what is happening? We at kolkhozes and sovkhoses do not have the right to sell a cow which long ago stopped being a cow because it provides less milk than a goat. But we do not have the right to sell it, since herd size is not set by us and we cannot change it.

A decision was made about the herd too, giving kolkhozes and sovkhoses the right to choose how many cows to keep and which cows. And it is not being carried out.

Tell me how many times in the last slightly more than 40 years a decision has been made which prohibits planning planted areas in kolkhozes and sovkhoses? After all, it does an enormous amount of damage to our society. Let us count on our fingers: the September 1953 Plenum, the March 1965 Plenum, the April 1985 Plenum, and, finally, the 27th Congress. The all-Union conference was in March right after the 27th Congress and before the planting. But all the planted areas were already scheduled in the previous spirit for the whole 5 years on the eve of the congress in October. And when the representatives of oblasts hinted they themselves should decide that, they were told by one boss: so, he said, you feel like independence? Freedom? But freedom is a recognized state necessity. Our areas planted to grain have been reduced. The task is to increase them. So do it.

Independence is worth something when it is unconditional, and laws and decrees are valuable when they are followed by everyone without exception.

Ustinov Attacks Yevtushenko

Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 6 May 87 p 8, 9

[Speech by Valentin Ustinov (Moscow)]

[Text] The main thing that has happened in the life of the country's writers' organization is that nothing has happened.

Nothing of what we talked about and dreamed about a year before the congress and during the congress and what we waited for a year after it has happened. Where are the new periodical literary publications--the monthlies, the weeklies, and the quarterlies? They do not exist. Where are the new publishing houses--the central and local, the regional, the oblast? They do not exist unless one counts the permission proclaimed in the decree to establish branches of SOVREMENNİK and DETSKAYA LITERATURA in Siberia. Where are the long-awaited literary stipends? They say there is authorization for 10 stipends. For one thing, 10 is ridiculously few for the entire country. Secondly, to whom will they be assigned (if they are assigned), by whom, and according to what principle? That is a great mystery. But if that is so, then where is the openness to which we are called and to which we call one another? Where are the television programs with talk about writers and writers' opinions on literature and social problems? Regular shows, interesting, with more and more new names? They do not exist. Now and then the familiar faces of Aleksandr Ivanov, Robert Rozhdestvenskiy, Yevgeniy Yevtushenko, Voznesenskiy, and Okudzhava turn up on diabolical whirlwind tours, but even they are overwhelmed and overshadowed by the newly appearing metallic waves of rock music. Finally, where is the author's right which would protect the interests of the literary figure and his right to create and to make a living in order to create, against the arbitrariness of the publishers, printers, booksellers, and all the other organizations which supervise and monitor, like Goskomizdat [State Committee for Publishing Houses, Printing Plants, and the Book Trade] and VAAP [All-Union Agency for Authors' Rights]; they vigilantly follow their own cost accounting but are not very concerned about the cost accounting of the members of our writers' organization whose creative works they use.

Naturally, we cannot say that the Writers' Union governing board has not accomplished anything at all. The members of the special bureau of six respected writers--called upon, by intent, to determine the organization's strategy in restructuring--have assumed several key positions in a number of social organizations and head two journals which have published a number of works that were written long ago but seem to have been cut off from the cultural life of the country. We are grateful to them for that, but still when we voted for the bureau we expected more from our distinguished colleagues.

Involved in the inevitable busywork, the secretaries of the "large" governing board have concentrated the main part of their own and the apparatus's efforts on creating councils: of criticism, poetry, prose, work with young people, propaganda, and so on. As a result of the many months of efforts, the councils were set up and even met once or twice and discussed writers' problems, with stenographic records. So many stenographic records! So many fine ideas are concealed in them! Will they be summarized and put into practice sometime? Judging from the way restructuring is going with us, the hope is a weak one.

But what prevented the Writers' Union and the governing board elected almost a year ago from focusing efforts on implementing the measures listed above and many others which were not listed, without which all the talk about restructuring in our guild will just remain talk?

I am not lifting the blame from our elected organs and from the workers of the secretariats and the apparatus subordinate to them (including the Moscow Writers' Organization) which are supposed to directly carry out this work. It is true that they have tried to carry it out by presenting and preparing a whole series of documents. But it turned out that they were doing this too slowly.

Why? It is in this "why" that the root of the problem which the organization encountered in the past year is concealed.

The organization seemed to forget the sense of the guild as a whole and the unity of goals and ways to achieve these goals. Under the guise of openness and democracy many figures have appeared on television, in the press, and at various meetings with announcements which simply mislead public opinion. Personal-publicity (and hence economic) considerations prevailed over elementary fairness to colleagues. The outbursts of irrepressible ambition could be excused if they did not upset the equilibrium of truth in the organization and if they did not indirectly result in very unfortunate future economic prospects for dozens of the union's members. And I believe it is our common duty to revive fairness and help our colleagues find not only the right but the opportunity to be involved in the creative labor for which they have prepared themselves, not 1 year but dozens of years.

I am certain that our popular poet-publicist Yevgeniy Aleksandrovich Yevtushenko did not display the wisdom and fair objectivity which is essential for a secretary of the "large" union this past year. It was he who took the

initiative to announce to the entire country, using all channels, that not a single remarkable poet in any respect has appeared in the last 25 years and that a time of no poets has come. The poets' guild at first regarded such statements ironically: fears and the bitter taste of loss of leadership sounded much too clearly in them. I remember back in May of last year MOSKOVSKIY LITERATOR received a frank letter from the poets to Yevgeniy Yevtushenko, condemning his conduct. But, I repeat, we regarded everything that had happened with too much good nature and irony. But for nothing. Yevtushenko's negative attitude toward modern poetry was seized with delight by booksellers and the press and created a certain opinion among influential organizations. A whole number of literary figures (obviously afraid to lag behind in "democratic openness") seized the idea and shouted to the whole country about the domination of "dullness" in literature. They were different in terms of intensity of passions of their articles and statements and in terms of level of desire for objectivity; they were united in one thing: they only did not include themselves and two or three other like-minded people among the "dull ones."

The example of the elders inspired those who are now from 30 to 40 years old but are not yet members of the Writers' Union. Using direct pressure to try to push their manuscripts through to the publishing houses, they were glad to use all the megaphones the press offered them to begin to shout that the Writers' Union consisted completely of hacks, opportunists, and reactionaries and that they were the heralds and heroes of a new time. They even considered Yevgeniy Yevtushenko, the herald of the 1960's, to be one of those who had generated the market-oriented current affairs poetry of the 1970's. In passing the newly appearing vanguards spoke very derisively of their peers who did not want to oppose the generation but wanted to join together to work to purify society's morals. As for their peers in the country, in Russia, the "heralds of the 1980's" grouped them all together in one contemptuously featureless term: "Ivanov's, Petrov's, and Sidorov's."

The insult to the Writers' Union and its leadership was unquestionable. This was behavior for shock value, snobbery, and self-advertisement. Nonetheless, it was precisely Writers' Union organs (true, not just these organs) which the so-called "young people" were offered for articles and roundtable discussions. Among them were NOVYY MIR, LITGAZETA, and LITBOZRENIYE. The journal YUNOST, again headed by the secretary of the "large" Union Andrey Dementyev, offered its pages to the "young vanguard" this year and last. It is true that No 4 of YUNOST at last published their poetry, and after that it was simply uncomfortable to shout about their innovations and especially their genius. The old truth was clarified: you can make announcements about yourself all you want, but in the end the text still decides.

But there is no peace. Professionals are evaluating the texts. But the YUNOST readers still innocently believe in the printed word. They go to listen to the "new poets" proclaimed by the literary press.

Those are the successes of the "new wave." As for the "old wave," that is, us, the status of the poets (and now already quite a large number of prose writers, too) is most unfortunate. The editions of books being published by them has been reduced to a minimum and the price per line and per printed page

in contracts is set at lower rates, since poetry, criticism, and some prose is being declared unprofitable. The state committees have recommended that publishers reduce the positions of modern poetry, giving paper back to reprint the classics. In the meantime the number of verse writers in our professional union is one-fifth the total. And if, instead of protecting its members and uniting them, the Writers' Union continues to avoid studying and trying to solve problems, taking the opinions of certain individuals and groups as truth, the situation may turn out to be dangerously explosive for our common task.

But the task facing us is very simple and natural: we must consolidate all forces for the common cause. And the common cause for literary figures in our country should be one thing: to create spiritually constructive, patriotic morals in society by means of the word.

Tsitsishvili on Georgian Theater

Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 6 May 87 p 9

[Speech by Georgiy Tsitsishvili (Georgia)]

[Excerpts] As you know, great disasters struck Georgia this year. A great deal of harm was done to the economy and many people died. Numerous letters, money orders, and material, technical, moral, and ethical help came from all corners of our Motherland during these difficult days for us. I want to take this occasion and, since representatives of all our fraternal peoples are here, express our great and deep gratitude. We felt the support on the part of the Writers' Union and the support of many, many writers. For example, S.V. Mikhalkov transferred a large sum of money. And I will never forget the letter from one boy, a fifth-grader in Siberia, who saved money for a bicycle and then sent this entire sum to the people who had suffered from the disaster. Of course, that sum is small compared to the sum the party and the government allocated to our republic. But the main thing is that that boy is an internationalist and will continue to be an internationalist. The point is that natural disasters seem to show us our real personality--fraternity, friendliness, internationalism. It is really a manifestation of genuine internationalism, and that is why this aid is so valuable and precious to us.

I recall the words of a prominent Georgian scholar and writer of the 1920's. When he was reproached as to why he changed to the Soviet platform so late (at the time there were many "platforms"--Soviet, anti-Soviet, and so on), he said: If a person has a lot of baggage and he gets out of the railroad car, he has to carry that baggage. But a person who has no baggage and is as naked as a jaybird jumps from the car to the platform right off."

I think that in our restructuring there will be many "naked" people, both in the sense of creativity and in the sense of human traits, who will manage to jump on the "platform" before others but then will still trip over their own feet and reproach others for being late in restructuring. We must avoid that.

Our plenum is being held on a very high level. I have been a witness to many plenums and I am very glad that all of us here are speaking of what is the main and most important thing today.

How do we in the Writers' Union of Georgia understand restructuring? There are two aspects to this: the restructuring of all our organization work, intraunion restructuring so to speak, that is, finding new forms of work with writers; and the second aspect--the way in which our writers' fraternity and our multinational literature reflects restructuring in the economy, culture, and science, that is, the artistic reflection of restructuring. The first cause is easier, the second more difficult. Elections at a plant are one thing, but in the union they are something else again. I am not against democracy but I want us to understand this very important stage of our activity and our thinking more responsibly. For example, when directors of enterprises are elected, the wage fund remains the same and the weakness of the manager does not cost all the others in the pocketbook: they can elect a liberal or an uninformed person--the main thing is that he is nice and obliging. But when an election will cost his subordinates in their pocketbooks, they will tolerate even a crude or difficult character, if only he knows his work and is a good organizer. We should also think on that.

I remember the words of I.V. Abashidze who is here (he is perhaps the only delegate of the first congress of the USSR Writers' Union). He said: "Let's suppose that we introduce full democracy in the opera theater and we're going to choose singers by the democratic principle. It won't work out. The conductor, the musical authority, must select those voices."

I also cannot help but recall the words of the great Ilya Chavchavadze. He said that you not only have to count voices, you also have to consider whose voice it is.

Our writers' union and all republic writers' unions have great difficulties. First, we have a poor printing base. Without a base there will be no restructuring even for us, people of a pure trade who, it would seem, need only paper and pencil. And I especially want to emphasize that partnership is absolutely necessary. It has been said here that 5 years is needed to publish a book. And in our republic another 5 years is needed to translate the book into Russian. That means that a book by a Georgian author will reach a Russian-speaking reader in 10 years, and during that time Russian writers will have worked through the topic ages ago.

Writers cannot do without the theater. A dramatist writes a play, but the theater... does not put on the play. Two of the republic's leading theaters-- imeni Mardzhanishvili and imeni Rustaveli--did not open the season on time because they were traveling abroad all the time. It turns out that our audience has no theater--nothing from our dramaturgy has been put on there.

We writers cannot do without partnership with other creative unions, departments, and institutions. We have a 200,000 ruble income from our newspaper and the Bureau of Propaganda but the Ministry of Finances and the bank do not give us the opportunity to use this money. So restructuring is needed for them and for us; otherwise all this will be empty talk.

S. Alekseyev Faults Young Writers

Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 6 May 87 pp 9, 10

[Speech by Sergey Alekseyev (Vologda)]

[Excerpts] Here at the plenum people have said that representatives of all possible youth groups are being invited to editorial offices. All the same they most likely should not be invited to our editorial offices; we should ourselves go to them when they are shouting and singing. And only there can we understand what is going on.

I am personally appealing to comrades Rozov and Borshchagovskiy, who say that there is nothing terrible in that. But we must not fail to point out that things are not so good. We have a fine weapon--the word. I am appealing to people in mid-life, in terms of experience rather than age--to experienced people--for the following reason: young people alone cannot accomplish, understand, and interpret many things. We can only understand these phenomena--for what reason and why this occurs--together. First, our culture, our national culture, and the national culture in the republics must be raised so that our youth do not rush into this mass trap.

Andrey Voznesenskiy said here that those same boys who shout there go into the radiation zone in Chernobyl and do great things. No, those who yell do not go into the radiation zone in Chernobyl--they dig up graves, most likely.

And I understand: when he wrote "Rov" [The Ditch] he probably felt the same thing toward these people.

What is going on? I am trying to figure it out. Even recently the talk of the town was that middle-aged people always cursed and had a negative attitude toward those young people who wore long hair and tight pants and went around with taperecorders at their waists. And old people always grumbled at them. But what is happening now? Why is Comrade Rozov beginning to understand them? What is this--restructuring? If it is restructuring, then it is much too elementary: we did not understand them before but now we have understood and let us support them.

To go on. I have gotten the impression from speeches that young people now supposedly come to literature very easily. It seems as if now positions in publishing houses have already been marked and doors to journals have been opened--come in and work. But this ease is deceptive. No one has ever come to literature easily, not one generation. Perhaps it is even wrong to divide into generations. It is difficult for any literary figure to come to literature; it cannot be otherwise. As an example, new replacements, young ones, come along to take the generation's place, but then they receive a legacy. What, though, for example, does the current young generation receive as a legacy? We say: many thanks for what you have done--we inherited great literature with which we learned and grew, but then we also got those same boys singing God-knows-what. We did not raise them--they grew up in these years of permissiveness. Let us now fight against this together--let us unite

and fight. And this is not at all some kind of bravura. I, for example, have a very sober understanding of this and I evaluate it and it bothers and disturbs me. And it seems to me that sacrifice is needed to get through to reason. Precisely sacrifice, some element of martyrdom, because it is difficult. For a long time we did not talk but kept silent about drug addiction, for example, but now we have begun to talk about it and struggle against it. That is the way it is with every phenomenon--people must acknowledge it and begin to work with it.

As an example let us recall the exhibit and discussion of plans for a monument on Poklonnaya Mountain. I suggest we ponder the situation: not one of the more than 100 plans was chosen and accepted even as a basis. The arrangers of the exhibit and critics noted with satisfaction: they are all different, each to his own, so to speak, and the selection is enormous. But that immediately puts me on guard. Yes, every artist thinks and sees in his own way. But how can that be? Authors of plans educated in the richest and ancient experience of Russian sculptors and architects have no unified school of thought and no unified source of symbolic forms and signs.

And, finally, there is no unified understanding of moral values. I do not know and I will not undertake to predict how the new round of examination will end, but there is the danger that under such an arrangement, the monument might already have to be taken down in 20 years and built again, if, of course, any plan is accepted. At first everything should be reduced to a common denominator, and then plan and examine. After all, an altogether definite system of symbols understandable even to children has existed for all time and still exists. Let us recall the monument at Kulikovo Field and at Borodino Field. Or it is quite simple: look at the Kremlin, at the cathedral, go inside. Even an ignorant person can easily determine what is what. And the monument on Poklonnaya is to stand for many centuries. How will our descendants decipher what some cunning authors encoded in their plans?

It seems to me that the present discord both in art and in literature--and these parts of culture are inseparable--arises from a lack of spiritual tuning. In the 70 years of our history perhaps 7 literatures can be counted which have quite precise forms and paths of development and their own peaks and declines. But which of them will reach our distant descendants and which one will they use to form an opinion of us, today's people? We must not forget that they will also have their own literature. Great luck befell my generation. Under us it finally became possible to speak the whole truth and the concepts of the "banned topic," the notorious "neprokhodnyak" [not further identified], and the like will disappear from the writer's lexicon. I am certain that the time will soon come when we will not run from our own shadows and fear every bush. But a residual feeling, a kind of psychosis, still exists that suddenly something will change and the curtains will close again. So a certain haste arises--faster, faster, say it, speak out. And now another literature is emerging before our eyes--a literature of exposure, criticism, and super-sensationalism. And if we read certain publications it would appear that nothing is more important than drug addiction, prostitution, and the "Lyubertsy." The leader of an informal rock-music association is already saying to journalists that all his days for interviews are scheduled a week in advance. But let us think. Prostitutes and drug addicts and even the leader

of an informal association do not feed and clothe us and put shoes on our feet. But who is now going to tell us how the ploughman, the lathe operator, and the baker live and what they think?

Let us finally come to believe that truth and openness are forever. There is simply no road back. But at the present time the desire to tell about the negative aspects of our life is nothing at all like truth in its primordial sense but like a fashion to tell the truth. Any fashion, whether it is in clothing, in entertainment, or in way of thinking, conceals a deadly danger within it. Fashion is capable of rapidly seizing and leading away an enormous number of people, but then it just as swiftly arouses disgust. Fashion has destroyed more than one great and noble undertaking. Let us recall how warmly and extensively we began to talk about saving cultural and historic monuments and the speeches orators gave from the most diverse forums--your blood froze in your veins. It seemed at that moment that all the people would pour out onto the street and come to the defense of their legacy. However, time passes and monuments are pulled down: and only the poet Mikhail Karachev from Vologda lay down under the bulldozer, plus a group of children in Moscow and the student pickets at the Angleterre Hotel. One should not give orations about a great responsibility--the right to tell the truth.

Throughout all time a feature of Russian literature has been that it is based on life, that is, it examines the human spirit. From the apocryphal works and Lives of the Saints to "War and Peace," "Crime and Punishment," "Quiet Flows the Don," "Privychnoye delo" [The Customary Thing], "Proshchaniye s Matyoroy" [Farewell to Matyora], and "Posledniy poklon" [The Last Bow]. Today worldly literature which exists for a day, for a certain event, and for a particular taste is beginning to become more and more important. One can decidedly say about some novels that they have a lot of information, that supposedly after reading them a person would know a lot about science, about the internal life of a taxi fleet or a department store, about how BAM was built and how Tyumen oil was worked. But really you must turn to reference rather than artistic literature for that information. What can you find out about the human spirit from reading such works?!

Suleymenov on Kazakh's Unpublished Writers

Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 6 May 87 p 10

[Speech by Olzhas Suleymenov (Kazakhstan)]

[Text] Reflecting on the theme of the plenum "The Present and Literature," we understand that events in life and literature do not happen suddenly. The entire course of the joint development of society and the individual lays the groundwork for them.

I second the pathos of B. Mozhayev's speech. Our country is really vast and has many faces and the speed of restructuring is not the same everywhere. That is natural, unfortunately. Suffice it to compare the "repertoire" of several journals in the capital with the content of our oblast and republic journals in order to understand: freedom of creativity and openness are spreading through the country with various... inhibitions. For example, in Moscow and

here at the plenum voices are heard which call for suspending or banning altogether publication of works of writers of past years. But in our republic attempts to print the poetry of the best poets of the 1920's-1930's who were unjustly repressed are ending with the usual shouting. And I think to myself: suppose the Muscovites get really fed up and they stop printing or the list ends. Then our Makzhan and Shakarim will not get their turn again. For the umpteenth time, since the first attempts were back in 1956. We do not have so many great poets that we can so carelessly dispose of their fate and work.

I will repeat what I said at the congress: a great culture makes even its small cultures great because it is great. A small culture even tries to disparage its great ones because it is small.

What has changed now? In the republic a great deal in the social sphere and the moral atmosphere is changing, plus in the economy. Ideology should, it would seem, go before restructuring. But with us ideology has always been and remains hard of hearing. The people are always asking Moscow about something, but they do not listen to us like they used to either. The lack of an equal dialogue for decades has distorted the direction and development of spiritual culture.

Preparing for the report at the ninth congress of the republic's writers which was held in April of last year, I read several dozen stories and novels which had come out in Russian and in Kazakh within the five-year plan period. There were various books on various subjects, but they had one thing in common. The make-up of characters was mononational in almost all of them. In life we work with international collectives, but this reality is not consistently reflected in works and they unintentionally teach an isolated kind of consciousness. One book stood out for the natural multinational character of its heroes--"Probuzhdenyy kray" [The Awakened Kray] by Musrepov. He died in December 1985 after finishing the novel--the labor of his entire life. The last master of the galaxy of founders of Kazakh Soviet literature. He left us a book about how the Kazakh working class emerged and became stronger in an alliance with the Russian proletariat. He left it as a legacy to continue this important work. The main theme of the works of all our vigorous group of four prose writers--M. Auzzov, Mukanov, Mustafin, and Musrepov--is: alone we can accomplish nothing, we must work together. But why has this idea been diluted and reduced to nothing in the books of writers of the subsequent generations?

After the congress we held a roundtable discussion in the journal PROSTOR where Russian, Kazakh, German, Uighur, and Korean writers talked frankly about these things for the first time. Then a plenum devoted to this same question was held. A discussion of "The International Theme in the Literature of Multinational Kazakhstan," held at the secretariat of the Writers' Union governing board in Moscow, took place on 12 December. We did not say that disturbing disorder exists in society, and we did not see it; we merely talked about the disorder noted in our literature.

But a few days later, on 17-18 December, discouraging events took place where for the first time a sense of alienation manifested itself as mass consciousness.

After Chernobyl the dialogue became known to everyone: "What is the probability of an accident at an atomic power plant?"--"One chance in a million." We in Kazakhstan also lulled ourselves with these same metaphors. "The republic of 100 languages." "The laboratory of the friendship of peoples." And suddenly the accident. The radiation singed everyone. And now we are painfully aware that internationalism is not a given, but the fruit of hard, everyday labor. This work does not forgive carelessness.

The bitter lesson must be studied in every one of the country's writers' organizations--not formalistically but with an understanding of the need to learn to live in conditions of democracy in a multinational country. We must not try to make it appear that an annoying misunderstanding of a local nature took place. The nuclear decay reaction has been rocking the major capitalist states for a long time now. Ideas of ethnic isolationism do not, alas, recognize territorial borders. To them borders are in the consciousness of man, that is, in the sphere which is dependent on the word. And speaking of affirming social justice, we probably should also be constantly considering the efficacy of the factor of national justice. Although the nationality question itself has been solved in the country, the problems of international relations exist, and, as is becoming clear, they are quite acute. We must be prepared for the possibility that centrifugal forces may be revitalized in an atmosphere of accelerated development of democracy, and literature is capable of speeding them up or stopping them.

M. Alekseyev cited a good example from a song where the general seems to overwhelm the particular: "My address is not a house or a street..." Really, what good is it if a person has no house or street. Perhaps the authors of the song merely wanted to express pride in the large and the general rather than a nihilistic attitude toward the small homeland. In the war years our international unity was acutely perceptible. The country's fate depended on its strength at that time. And the writers of those years did not ignore the megatasks--indoctrinating Soviet man, the patriot of the whole country. That was internationalism's war against nationalism, and the Great Patriotic War differed from the thousand previous wars in history because of this special ideological category. Our generation was indoctrinated in that spirit too, and we came to literature in the early 1960's when the term "Soviet people" was still our recognized name for ourselves. Then, with the decades the category of the Great Fatherland abated, and it was not so alive and vital within us, as if it had disintegrated in consciousness to a multitude of small homelands. Was it that that became the spiritual support of the philosophy and practice of regionalism, selfish protectionism, cliquishness, and compatriotism, which has appeared actively in the social life of the 1970's-1980's?

These prejudices which are destructive to international consciousness were not revived suddenly and in one place, and we must consider their revival a result of weakened class immunity in the entire society; the nationalist disease can appear in any region. The ailment must be treated patiently and for a long time, without driving the disease inside; it must be treated by involving the entire country in the process of open ["glasnyy"], democratic normalization.

I am reminded of V.V. Karpov's intonation at the place in the report where he digressed from the text and started to talk about children. Speaking with tenderness and some despair and even envy, he said that his grandchildren will not have to restructure. Our grandfathers and fathers also hoped that we would live in an unclouded time and for the sake of that, they carried the burdens and sacrificed themselves. But in order for their sacrifices not to have been in vain, we now again take up the extremely heavy burden of the past and of our own time.

The present restructuring of society means growth of the country and, as dialectics say, rapid growth of the economy, morality, and social reason. But for our children and grandchildren to be happy, we too must experience happiness in order to pass on to them something more than just difficulties and hurt feelings. We must win in the struggle against lies, slander, and the baseness of prejudice. We want to believe that this is our last decisive battle against the dull bureaucratic scum who will try to separate us even further using their old, proven methods.

Peters on Nuclear Power in Latvia

Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 6 May 87 p 10

[Speech by Yanis Peters (Latvia)]

[Text] By now our time has its orders and its infarctions. Its victims and its heroes have appeared as in any revolutionary time.

When the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev was in Latvia in February of this year, with the astonishment and sincere interest of a person who wanted to understand, he repeatedly posed the question of why people still express either doubt or distrust of the cause of restructuring and why desires to hold back and not deviate from the course outlined are heard so often.

As a writer working in the system of the governing board of our writers' organization for a little more than 2 years, and that was a period when there was an active start to the party's new course, I have accumulated my reflections regarding this contradiction when, on the one hand, the activization of the working masses is evident and on the other--voices of doubt and at times even notes of disbelief and despair are heard.

The Latvian Republic, in my opinion, has made no small contribution to creating an atmosphere of political openness in our country. An example of that is the conference of representatives of the American and Soviet communities held in Yurmala. Various points of view confronted one another at this forum and Latvian television broadcast the course of the conference practically from the beginning to the end. Therefore, the direct translation of Margaret Thatcher's press conference with Soviet journalists which was so extensively discussed by our community did not arouse particular surprise.

Last autumn during my trip around the United States of America I was asked: how did they dare broadcast the conference in Yurmala in Soviet Latvia when

the Americans there said such supposedly unpleasant things for the Soviet government? I very sharply answered the Americans, among whom were Latvian immigrants, that after all, all this has been openly heard in "Voice of America" broadcasts for more than 40 years. The point is the status of the Baltic Republics. The inhabitants of our republic have known their point of view for a long time, and even children know it.

We could only gain by not preventing the Americans from stating their opinion about this. A confrontation occurred between Soviet and outdated American ways of thinking. And in this confrontation it was apparent to everyone that we had won by assessing the state of affairs soberly and realistically.

I would not want to look like a braggart, but Latvia was one of the first, if not the first, to hold elections for a director at a major industrial enterprise--RAF [Riga Bus Factory]. The whole country saw these elections on Central Television and even the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Comrade Gorbachev praised them.

I would like to also mention here the first Language Festival organized this spring by the Writers' Union and the Ministry of Education of Latvia, which aroused lively interest in other Soviet republics and abroad.

Today the literary legacy of Zenta Maurini, at one time categorically rejected, is being assimilated in the republic creatively and in a new way; the study of Dostoyevskiy's works occupies a significant part in it. The fact that the writer died as an emigre is now no obstacle to publishing some of her works in Soviet Latvia.

We are also restructuring the attitude toward the long poems of Aleksandr Chak on the Latvian riflemen, and I think that it is this restructuring and this time of new thinking that will enable us to print his long poems in full for the first time.

The positive initiatives and changes I have cited give cause for optimism and activate the life of society.

But why is there doubt? Where is the disbelief from? What does even despair come from? From the fact that forces are found more and more often which attempt to push projects created in the years of stagnation, irresponsible schemes, and short-sighted decisions into the offices of high-ranking leaders. In short, the past is not giving up.

Do I dare look straight into the eyes of my readers when they are alarmed by the threat that an enormous part of the republic may be flooded? Its destruction is inevitable if the "Gidropoyekt" scheme--the construction of the Daugavpils GES--is realized. In the republic press 30,000 residents of our republic of various nationalities spoke out against it. LITERATURNAYA GAZETA carried an emotional statement and we are grateful to the editorial office for that; and we are also grateful for the dialogue between Uldis Berzinsh and Marina Kostenetskaya devoted to international questions which are so vital to us... Thanks also to Sergey Zaiygin, who in issue No 1 of NOVYY MIR for 1987 wrote: "What will happen to tiny Latvia, what losses will Belorussia suffer

for nothing if the most uneconomical in the series of GES's is built--the Daugavpils?"

But while the community tries to save our native land, we have editors who reject poetry which mentions the word "Daugava" from publication for no other reason than not to anger His Majesty "Gidroproyekt."

Recently a woman opened the door of my office in the Writers' Union and said: "I'm looking for a Latvian Valentin Rasputin."

This woman and many others who have come to the Writers' Union believe: "There's nowhere else to go, if writers can't save us, no one can."

The fate of the city of Yurmala, which is known to everyone, also disturbs those looking for a Latvian Rasputin. Yurmala is of course no Baikal and it is not the northern rivers, but if Yurmala dies, something will die in all of us--in Latvians and Russians, Estonians and Armenians, Finns and Swedes. The illegal felling of pine trees, which reaches 5,000 trees a year, continues in Yurmala, not to mention the water pollution. At the present time attempts are being made to authorize construction of a Moscow Soviet sanatorium in a place where 4,000 pine trees are growing, rather than a 50-hectare vacant plot near it where not one but two whole sanatoriums could be built without destroying even an inch of the pine forest and dunes.

This is what the construction engineer Anatoliy Umbras wrote on this account in the city newspaper YURMALA: "As everyone knows, the Latvian SSR Council of Ministers by its 15 April 1977 decision declared a 1-kilometer zone along the coast of Riga Bay to be a state preservation site. Clear-cutting and disturbance of the topsoil is prohibited in it and all construction work and excavation is prohibited in a zone 500 meters wide. There are enough other places in Yurmala for building sanatoriums for many decades to come. However, there are clients for whom this law is not the law."

The Moscow Soviet associates decided to build a sanatorium in Yurmala and chose an area in the Jaunkemeri Dunes, right in the middle of the forest, and planned to cut 4,000 pines to do it. One cannot deny the desire to make the following parallel: in recent years employees of the Moscow Soviet have been harshly criticized for the facelessness of the new construction areas in the capital and for destruction of cultural monuments which are of great historical value, but to cut 4,000 pine trees in one sweep in tiny Yurmala--how can that be called a decision?

The Yurmala community is certain that the Moscow Soviet leadership does not know anything about the threat to the pine forest, so I therefore ask those responsible employees of the CPSU Central Committee at the plenum to tell this story to the Moscow Soviet leadership. Perhaps it is not necessary to appeal to the Central Committee but ask the main editor of FITIL, S.V. Mikhalkov, to come there and help us save Yurmala.

Sergiy Zalygin talked yesterday about the modern water management specialist. We need engineer-technocrats indoctrinated in the new ethics--ones who will try to understand the history, folklore, traditions, and ethnic psychology of

the inhabitants of the republic and the territory which is to be flooded according to the (possibly brilliant) plan which he has worked out. If the most splendid plan for building the GES offends the self-consciousness of the inhabitants of the small republic (in this case we are speaking of Latvia and Belorussia), then international depression emerges and even in the light of the GES's 1 million watts people will be cold. I am no longer speaking of the fact that the construction of the Daugavpils GES would destroy many established village farms. It would do additional material harm to our republic, where even now 200,000 rural inhabitants do not have well-equipped housing.

It is clear from the examples I have cited that the unretreating and at times hidden but sometimes even openly aggressive avalanche of the past continues to impede the process of restructuring. The future depends on the results of the struggle of today's progressive and conservative forces. The only thing I would wish is that the infarctions in this struggle are as few as possible--otherwise, there will be no one to wear the orders.

L. Vasilyeva on 'Ecology of Women'

Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 6 May 87 p 10

[Speech by Larisa Vasilyeva (Moscow)]

[Text] It turned out that I watched the television broadcast on V. Karpov's meeting with young writers in a sanatorium among approximately 30 people, agricultural workers and workers of Moscow area factories and plants--among the very people whom our souls are looking after. They listened to all this in complete silence. (They did not know that I was from the writers' world). I watched and I saw everything as it is in reality--I saw this literary "iceberg" [in English transliteration] and felt all the enormous underwater part of it. And when the broadcast ended, one person said: "I didn't understand a thing!" A second person said: "And you aren't going to understand." But a third person said: "What is there to understand--it's a fight." "So what's there to fight about?" Someone explained to him: "The old men are fighting there so those young people echo them like parrots..."--"And what's there to fight about?"--"Something--money!" My heart leapt to my throat--I wanted to say, explain, state, and shout that it was not so... but... the people went to drink their evening kefir. And I did not sleep the whole night and thought about how we do not very often understand and how we do not see that very reader--we do not see him, our mysterious friend, and we do not think about whether he sees us and what he thinks of us. We are visible to him not only through our books but through our appearances on the pages of our enormous periodical press, in a country where today everyone knows how and loves to read.

And here I am sitting here and in the most crucial moments I have only one desire--to bring peace! You do not have the right not to agree! You say a lot here and you seem very daring to yourself, but you do not agree on the main thing. Agree! And--after breaking up, according to the well-known law, you will join together. I am saying this to you as a woman. Why am I saying

"you" [vy]? Because there are we women of literature and you have lost us. Have you lost us or not found us yet?

When I look at our large literary house today, I see an enormous bachelor's apartment stuffed with junk which has not been fixed up in a long time. You appear not to notice that a strong and powerful women's literary tribe arrived a very long time ago. It is productive and works actively in verse, prose, criticism, and sociopolitical commentary. I do not see women in the presidium. Is it that you could not make room for Margarita Agashina and Margarita Aligery, for Silva Kaputinkyany, for Tanzila Zumakulova and Raisa Akhmatova--I can give many names?! Why? We will manage and we have managed and without more. But you do not understand one simple thing: an enormous army of women readers exists, and you men by no means answer their questions. And even your wives who give you tea and love you, read Agashina and Tokareva. This exists, it came along with national equality. If male writers had realized this earlier and had raised their voices in defense of the female writer, I think that the great maternal voice of Anna Akhmatova would have done much to consolidate male literary forces.

I hope that you have understood me correctly. I am not speaking of myself. Among women working in literature I am perhaps one of those who suffer less than others from the inattention not of the readers' world but of the writers' world.

I have here a whole enormous list of women who are actively living in our literature.

A writer must raise his voice in defense of lakes and rivers but the ecology of women--is that really not our common cause? The woman is the foundation of the family. We have no literary family.

It is astounding! Ustinov spoke and wanted to read two poems by young people. But you all shouted: "Don't!" What, have you lost the paternal feeling? No one but a woman will give this feeling back to you. Let her join the literary organs, secretariats, and governing boards and let her unify and organize you.

Perhaps with her help you will stop the group fighting and unite before the readers' world, which does not quite understand you and thinks that your hearts bleed for money.

After the discussions ended, Leonid Ivanov (Omsk) was given the floor and he took issue with A. Pletnev.

Then A. Voznesenskiy read a telephone message which came to the plenum from Academician D.S. Likhachev:

1. The "spectrum of literature," its potential, and its genres must be increased. There should be as much individuality as possible.

2. The accusation of necrophilia is an accusation against the entire culture. The past does not die. What we need is publication of what was not published in the past in mass-circulation journals.

3. The most important thing in literature now is repentance. It is not in vain that the film "Repentance" is making a triumphant procession on the screen.

Karpov's Closing Remarks

Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 6 May 87 p 10

[Speech by Vladimir Karpov]

[Text] Allow me first of all on behalf of the men sitting in the presidium to apologize to the women for not inviting them to the presidium and to acknowledge that the criticism on this account is just.

I want to speak in the words of A. Maldonis, who altogether correctly noted that if he had not been at this plenum he would have lost a great deal. I felt the same way.

I have the feeling that the plenum was very meaningful, the speakers were very good and talked correctly, even those who did not agree with one another argued in a well-supported and convincing way. And this confirms that the restructuring under way in the country has stimulated our social thinking.

It seems to me that the very time and the tasks which we face and which we are called upon to resolve have taught us a great deal. The speeches were in the social sense very broad, far-reaching, and important.

Now I want to ask you, not in justification but in order to understand the daily work of the secretariat, to imagine for a moment that the same speeches as those at the plenum, though perhaps even more emotional and passionate, take place every day in the offices of the first secretary and of all the working secretaries. Very often in expressing similar and perhaps even sharper and more candid opinions and extreme viewpoints face to face, an immediate reaction and an immediate decision is demanded of us working secretaries. By that I want to stress how complicated it is for us to work and how complex it is to find sensible solutions every time and be above cliquishness.

Bureaucracy and bad, destructive leadership must be eliminated. But without leadership nothing at all is possible! That is why you elected us. The Writers' Union is a very complex organism, in the ideological and the social and the economic sense. And everyone must be involved in this.

The speech by Yu. Surovtsev, who reduced our work to writing off some typewriters, some obsolete vehicles or tires, surprised me. The working secretariat does not do that. And how Yu. Surovtsev did not discern what we

do in 10 years of work in the secretariat staggers me. I will cite just one example.

The international forum "For a Nonnuclear World and for the Survival of Mankind" was held in February, as you know. The USSR Writers' Union apparatus was charged with preparations for this most enormous event, which we conducted along with other creative unions and conducted on such a level that we earned the gratitude of the party's Central Committee.

When people talk in an offhand and contemptuous manner about the secretaries whom you yourselves elect, it is, dear friends, simply insulting to me. After all, working secretaries have no privileges as compared to other writers. Secretaries are your colleagues, those who are compelled to set aside their own manuscripts for the sake of the common cause.

Dear friends, I confess to you that when I came to this plenum doubts overcame me, above all as to whether we were working correctly, doing things in the right way. I am convinced that in fact our work needs to be improved and some new forms have to be found. As usual we will be guided by the decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress and the 8th USSR Writers' Congress and the resolution which the plenum will now adopt.

It seems to me that we will leave this plenum with a sense of certainty that our union represents one of the leading detachments of the Soviet intelligentsia and is competent and vigorous and wholeheartedly supports the revolutionary transformations in the country and lives by the interests of its people and party.

The plenum adopted the resolution.

12424

CSO: 1800/609

ABKHAZ WRITER ON 'SERIOUS DAMAGE' OF BERIA YEARS

PM011516 [Editorial Report] Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 1 July 1987 carries on page 7 under the heading "Do Not Cut the Tree Off at the Roots" a 2,400-word interview with Abkhaz writer Bagrat Shinkuba by T. Arkhangelskaya, pegged to Shinkuba's 70th birthday. After talking about his recent work and latest publications, including translations of the great Georgian writers, Shinkuba goes on to reminisce about the years of his acquaintanceship with Aleksandr Tvardovskiy and Konstantin Simonov and their support for and interest in Abkhaz writers. Simonov, who spent more than 30 years in Abkhazia, supported Shinkuba in what he calls the "blackest days" of his life:

"...In 1947, as a young man, a young communist, and a candidate of sciences, together with my two colleagues G. Dzidzaria and K. Shakryl I sent a letter to the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks) Central Committee about the gross violations of Leninist nationalities policy in Abkhazia. As it turned out, the letter was returned. The party reprimand said: For attempted misinformation of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks) Central Committee and slander of the Abkhaz party organization. My comrades and I bore this brand for some 7 years, until the arrest of Beria. This was a very difficult period for Abkhazia and for its literature and culture. Abkhaz schools were closed and the promotion of national cadres was stopped. They even lifted their hands against D. Gulia, our literary patriarch, trying to compromise his 'History of Abkhazia' with a spurious pamphlet. All that was the result of lawlessness which began back in 1937."

Shinkuba praises Simonov's work in support of Abkhaz literature, and goes on:

"The Beria years did serious damage to our republic's development. These complexities had their effect for a long time. As is noted in one work devoted to the diversity of the cultural life of the USSR's peoples, 'the accretion of errors perpetrated in the past with regard to the Abkhaz nation, as well as the failure to settle a number of problems, served as a "source of censure from part of the Abkhaz population"'--those last words are taken from the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee resolution 'On Measures To Further Develop the Economy and Culture of the Abkhaz ASSR and Step Up Organizational and Ideological Education Work Among the Working People of the Autonomous Republic' (May 1978).

"I managed to survive and stand firm only thanks to my conviction that I was right, supported by my friends--Russian and Georgian."

Shinkuba goes on to mention friends from that period and then moves on to the contribution of young people in Abkhaz literature today, expressing approval of today's sense of needing to "analyze profoundly and comprehensively the experience of the past, both positive and negative, so as to preclude the slightest possibility of a repetition of past mistakes." He concludes by noting his concern for nature conservation, the theme of his current work.

/9604

CSO: 1830/611

HISTORY OF TAGANKA THEATER REVIEWED BY ACTRESS

Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 15 Apr 87 p 3

[Article by Alla Demidova: "The Taganka Theater. Losses and Hopes"]

[Text] "Unfortunately, we did not manage to meet with Lyubimov when we were on tour in Paris in February of this year... " That is the way I wanted to begin my article in order to tell about the present of Taganka Theater. But suddenly I thought: no matter how sad, still that has already become our yesterday. That is our past...

But what is the past--what has occurred? However, the premier of "The Kind Man from Szechuan" at school seems just yesterday, and after that the opening of the Taganka Theater--but, in fact, 23 years have already passed since that time... Just yesterday we saw off our comrade Volodya Vysotskiy on his last journey--but 7 years have already passed since that time... We still cannot completely believe that our teacher, the man with whom we began our life in the theater, did not come back from abroad--but almost 4 years have already passed... I still remember the words I used to try to dissuade A.V. Efros from going to the Taganka, where, no matter what, they would be waiting for him, and it would not be easy to work as the new main director. And still all together we have worked and tried to find a common language and, as it seems to me, mutually enriched one another. And suddenly this unexpected death...

And all this is also already our past. Even the recent success in France, the shouts of "bravo," the endless curtain calls for bows, the interviews and articles, and the meetings with directors and actors of Paris, where as in 1978 we won the hearts of the audience--then it was Lyubimov performances and now Efros performances, are also already the past.

But if even yesterday is the past, then what is the present? Or, as in N. Erdman's "Suicide": "tic" is when you are and "toc" is when you are already gone? But, after all, "Just as the future takes shape in the past, so the past decays in the future."

Using the example of the Taganka Theater I want talk about yesterday and think about how to go on living in the future. Today is a special time, a frontier

time. We are experiencing a flicker of portent in art and the "fresh wind of changes"...

It is quite clear to a person who is a lover of theater or who has simply gone to plays in recent years what each theater is like. Perhaps he would not express this in the necessary words, would not find in words an expression adequate to the language of each theater's expressive means, but such a spectator has a clear and definite idea of the theater. He knows what can be found there: what kind of a repertoire, what kind of an idea, and what manner of performance. Each theater has long ago found and established its "own" audience.

I have been going on stage at the Taganka for more than 20 years and I see how the interrelationships between the audience and theater change. In the mid-1960's when the theater emerged, the sharp form, the frontal mise en scene, direct address to the hall, the cinematographic montage of scenes, the foreshortening, the light, the youth of the performers--the thing which was briefly expressed in the word "Taganka"--struck the spectator. But this explosion of the usual form, this "rebelliousness," was not simply a reaction to the sleepy, academic, monotonous existence of theater in the 1950's--the theater was trying to find new expressive means for what was happening in life.

It was a turbulent time and new changes which brought a new esthetics to art came into being. By the end of the 1960's people had begun to think about their social illnesses and they were trying to find a reason for them and make a diagnosis. In the early 1970's people came to the Taganka for sharp words. The things we were talking about among ourselves and with friends in the kitchen the audience heard from the stage of the Taganka and said to each other in surprise: "Did they really allow them to do that?" But by the late 1970's the situation had changed, the illnesses had already been in need of treatment for a long time, but how?... By that time a person's life had become stratified to such a degree that without noticing it the person had even begun to stratify himself, becoming accustomed to the masks: at work he was one thing, with friends another, in the family circle yet another, and a fourth person on public transport, and so on. At one place and the other these masks existed on their own, not interfering with one another. A person's inner life became more and more separate from his outer, public life. A person thought one thing but sometimes said the exact opposite thing aloud. The theater attempted to come to the rescue and unite the split personality into a whole. The theater and its audience began to seek answers to "childish" questions: what I am living for? who am I? me and society, me and authority, me and life. People tried to connect this real internal life of theirs with their external life, which in many respects, alas, was already fabricated. But it turned out they did not have the strength to do it and in all spheres of public life reality became more and more relative: "kind of"... Kind of make friends, kind of be involved in social work... Kind of interpret art.

And the theater provided surrogates. An enormous gap between the feeling, the word, and the means of expression emerged. The actor is a professional

dissembler, a professional wearer of "masks." Is it possible to preserve one's own face and one's own personality behind these masks?

Vladimir Vysotskiy was the first actor who penetrated the patina of the fabricated life to prove that a real significant and unique personality stood behind the fabricated forms. And people responded--they reached toward him.

A definite period in our theater and a 20-year period of development of our art ended with his death. We understood extremely well that the time had come for new expressive means and new ideas. We did two plays: "Vysotskiy" and "Boris Godunov."

Pushkin's "Boris Godunov" had never worked on stage. It seemed to exist only for reading--but it was written for the theater. If an actor played through the Shakespearean passions incorporated into this tragedy, he could not keep pace with Pushkin's easy line and if he went with the rhythm of the lines, he could not play out the feelings. That barrier was removed at the Taganka. We had experience with plays in verse, there were always poets around--and there was the need dictated by the times: to finally unite the feeling and the word and find a new form of expression for it.

The play about Vysotskiy was important to us as a moral, ethical confession in which we purified ourselves spiritually and broke through from daily life toward the truth.

We began to remember more and more often that a moral idea stood behind the words. Before saying the true Word which would be believed, we had to put our own souls in order.

The theater was acquiring new life in the plays "Boris Godunov" and "Vysotskiy" and again became the Taganka where people went for answers to questions which pained their hearts. Neither play was put on. We were not able to defend them. Fatigue was also mixed in. We were left without a leader...

So it happened that Anatoliy Vasilyevich Efros--a director of a different theatrical school--became the theater's new leader. No, the theater did not "badger" him as V. Rozov, in his recent article in LITERATURNAYA GAZETA, considered a possible description of what was happening with us. We were trying to enter a new theatrical esthetics, and that wasn't so easy. Like a "carpentry brigade" (Efros called us that in his article), we worked our hardest. And we achieved a lot... Efros entitled his last article on the Taganka "I Am Again in Love." Together with him we carefully preserved the main old repertoire and performed several new plays: "The Lower Depths," "War Does Not Have a Woman's Face," and "The Misanthrope" and revived "The Cherry Orchard," which he had put on in 1975. But at the same time it seemed to us that the "Taganka" had lost its nerve, its sharpness. They were saying that we were losing our former audience, the "Taganka" audience. But, it seems to me, theatrical audiences have in general changed a lot. Who is this present "Taganka audience"? After all, the need for social wit, which the former Taganka audience satisfied in the theater, is now in many respects satisfied

by reading the papers. The search for social frankness today is in sociopolitical writing.

But let's think carefully: after all, the first shock of the newspaper sensations and our surprise that novels which had lain in the desk drawers for a long time were being published has already passed. We, of course, gulp down this reading and satisfy our hunger for what has been left unsaid. We are not yet accustomed to openness [glasnost]. We have only adapted ourselves to it, at times becoming over-infatuated with one of its sides--negative criticism... Perhaps V. Rozov's subjective article where without knowing the internal life of the Taganka Theater he accused the collective of badgering the director needs to be printed. But then, why does that same newspaper refuse to print the actors' response? Yes, the theater's real life is complicated but shouldn't it perhaps be reflected to the fullest extent?

How quickly we become accustomed to everything! The naked revelations of newspaper articles no longer surprise us and we merely pass them on to one another like spicy stories: "Did you read this article? No? Well, read it!" But when we read it we are indignant at the injustice for a moment and return again to our daily life. The writer does a bit of writing--the reader does a bit of reading... We have adapted ourselves... We are afraid of and don't trust abrupt changes. And indifference develops as a means of self defense, the most terrible manifestation of conformism. Philistine consciousness becomes paramount: the main thing is to avoid being involved, while in the material sense the level of expectations does not exceed the formula--"like my neighbor's, but a little better."

In the theater such a spectator does not get involved in the creative process of the action since this requires effort and preparation; he arrogantly notes to himself only the shortcomings of the play and reacts only to crude accents which have a powerful impact.

In its development the theater long ago departed from the demands of such an audience, but, unfortunately, it neglected to mold the audience's consciousness.

But recently we have become over-infatuated with meetings, administrative transformations, replacement of local people, and terminology, forgetting that our main task--I am speaking above all of the theater--is to awaken souls. After all, Russian art has always had an "SOS" sign--"save our souls."

Newspaper articles and administrative restructurings are not enough for the purpose of introducing social ideas into the soul. Even though I understand that that is also necessary. But after all, I do not play a part any better depending on whether I am going to be paid more or who is going to supervise or in what form... A common effort of spiritual restructuring is needed, awakening of interest in creative thought so that independence becomes a necessity of life. We must come out from behind the "masks"--define our own "ego."

It seems to me that this is what the theater should address today. Both in relationship to the audience and within itself. After all, only very honest

people who understand their own purpose can minister to souls. Our tasks can be resolved today through individuality rather than through the stereotype of mass consciousness. But we have forgotten the meaning of that word. Individuality is what makes one person distinct from other people.

N. Gubenko came to us at the Taganka. He took the place of Lyubimov and Efros. A new third cycle in the biography of the Taganka is beginning. Gubenko was an actor of our theater, we began together, he is a "Tagankanite," and I would like to hope that in close contact with the Taganka audience--not as a consumer but as our full partner--we will be able to take part in the awakening of the country and in the yearning of social creativity for restructuring and renewal. And we will try to be convincing, consistent, and worthy in this.

Of course, everything that is written in the newspapers today and printed for the first time and appears on the screen molds us. But a great deal has already been processed by our consciousness. We know our life well. When we read Valentin Rasputin's "Pozhar" [The Fire] for example, we are not surprised at the forms of this life--we know it--but we again and again suffer along with the author of this book. When we see the film "Repentance" by Abuladze, we are not surprised at the informational line of this film, since that entered our consciousness long ago, but we rejoice in yet another stage of our social life.

We need new artistic ideas since the main difficulties of today's theater, perhaps, are not so much in seeking new forms (although this is also essential, since we are still speaking in the complicated language of expressive means of the late 1920's) as in the moral-spiritual field. In order to speak of contemporary times, a spiritual foundation in keeping with those times is needed.

One wise man said: three conditions are necessary for spiritual development--great goals, great obstacles, and great examples. We have great goals--to awaken souls, there have always been and will continue to be great obstacles, and there are many great examples in our history of culture. Any real work of art presupposes purity, nobility, and loftiness of thought--without that it would not survive the test of time.

The main thing is that hope has been awakened in us.

...The sequoia grows in the Crimea. It is 2,000 years old. Sometimes when I go to the Crimea it seems to me that it has withered and died. Around it is verdure and the riot of nature but it stands bare and lifeless. But the next year I see it unexpectedly awakened and vigorous foliage covers its crown. It sometimes seems to me that our theater is like that sequoia: the trunk is the direction, the branches are the directors, and the leaves are the actors; they fall, rise, and new ones grow up. But the roots are deep in the earth. The roots of our theater are in the culture of our past. There are times of drought, but spring comes and the already-greening shoots, "languishing with spiritual thirst," begin to greedily soak up everything that the undying earth gives them.

WORKS OF VYSOTSKIY TO BE ARCHIVED IN STATE MUSEUM

Moscow TRUD in Russian 16 Apr 87 p 4

[Interview with Robert Rozhdestvenskiy, chairman of the Commission on the Literary Legacy of Vladimir Vysotskiy, by V. Shevatov, date and place not specified; first paragraph is source introduction]

[Text] The Commission on the Literary Legacy of Vladimir Vysotskiy has prepared new books of his poetry and songs for print. One of the first to see the light will be an anniversary collection for the poet's 50th birthday. The chairman of the commission, poet Robert Rozhdestvenskiy, told our correspondent about this. We present the interview with him to the readers.

[Question] "Not so long ago we the audience unexpectedly saw V. Vysotskiy larger than life and close-up in the Central Television program "Monologue." We saw a serious great poet. A great actor. That was how he came into the homes of millions of people who already had known him for a long time from his songs and films. But we know, television did not spoil him with attention while he lived. But now it is with television that we seem to discover Vysotskiy anew--Vysotskiy the actor and poet. We see the difficult and at times agonizing process of his work on songs... "

[Answer] "I knew of this television program a long time ago but I didn't know that the recording had been preserved till our day in original form," says R. Rozhdestvenskiy. "And this primitiveness, this roughness, these pauses, it seems to me, speak of Vladimir Vysotskiy's personality no less than his songs. The structure of his opinions and his thought are visible and understandable in this film. Even his character became more understandable to me personally. I think that is true for the audience too. That is what makes the program valuable. In my opinion it was successful because it was not simply a concert but a frank, unrehearsed talk with the audience. It was good it was preserved. Television and film archives should be preserved for history, for the future, and for the development of our culture."

[Question] "A great deal has become known about Vladimir Semenovich recently. And some people with surprise discovered for themselves the talented poet Vysotskiy, our contemporary and a citizen. It is good if that is the basis for the growth in his popularity. But is it perhaps a tribute to fashion?"

[Answer] "There is both one and the other here. However, I can say firmly that the growth in his popularity is natural above all because of the incredible talent and conviction in what he professed and its naturalness. After all, if that does not exist in creative work, popularity wanes in time. As for fashion, let's be frank, that also exists. In addition to genuine admirers of V. Vysotskiy and his real comrades, people are found who try to simply warm themselves at this fire and get in Vysotskiy's light in order to make themselves stand out more. Well, there have always been such people... I think that time will pass and only absolutely deserved praise of Vysotskiy will remain in history. Without hysterics which only impede the matter."

[Question] "Today when we support openness in our social life, we are especially acutely aware that Vysotskiy is one of the first people to speak directly of our painful problems and of what disturbs us in life."

[Answer] "Yes, he was such a person because he was a real artist. And genuine literature and poetry is always an expression of social pain. Every genuine artist writes in exactly the same way he lives. And he was like that. Genuine."

[Question] "Do you agree that Vladimir Vysotskiy's creative work is one of the highest points of this class of authored songs?"

[Answer] "Absolutely. The fate of man and the fate of the people are read in Vysotskiy's best songs. There is a very precise and clear dramatic art in them which many other songs lack. Recently I heard two concerts of the author's songs on television. There were successful works and there were what are called precious songs. They also probably have the right to exist. Vysotskiy said: 'The most valuable thing in authored songs is the atmosphere of trust, friendliness, casualness, and lack of restraints.' He believed people are attracted to such songs. All this was exactly what was in his songs. And in addition, they were surprisingly varied. Varied in method and in intonation--at times ironic, at times angry, at times humorous, at times stern, and at times tender."

[Question] "Robert Ivanovich, you knew Vladimir Vysotskiy. What stays in your memory from meetings with him?"

[Answer] "In 1977 we, a group of poets, were invited to France for a performance. In Paris a large evening of Soviet poetry was held in which K. Simonov, Ye. Yevtushenko, V. Korotich, B. Okudzhava, and Yu. Martsinkiyavichyus took part... Vysotskiy was also among us. The powerful poetry concert ended with his songs. There were 2,500 people in the hall and how warmly they received us! Vysotskiy, who ended our performance, was responsible for an enormous share of the concert's success... "

[Question] "Robert Ivanovich, you are the chairman of the commission on Vysotskiy's literary legacy. What can you tell us about its work?"

[Answer] "Where did our commission's work begin? First, with the fact that we were trying to assemble an archive of Vysotskiy and his manuscripts. The bulk, approximately 95 percent, of the archive is in the USSR State Literary

Museum. But a less significant part of it (random things, letters) is preserved in private collections. From time to time our archive is replenished with manuscripts, photographs, and video materials. Video materials also come from abroad. From Canada, Hungary, and France... Work to prepare publications of his works and recollections about him is now in full swing... Three of Vladimir Vysotskiy's booklets are being prepared for print. The first will be published by "Kniga" Publishing House. Right now a manuscript of his poetry is being worked on and is practically ready for print. This collection reconstructs the image of Vysotskiy from different sides. The collection also has recollections by his actor friends and recollections by those people who organized his concerts and traveled with him throughout the country. And there are poems in it. The collection "The Poet Vladimir Vysotskiy" has been prepared at the "Muzyka" Publishing House. Naturally it has poems and musical notation--guitar lines--in it. A large collection of the poet's poems--15 author's sheets--will come out at the "Sovetskiy pisatel" Publishing House. The proposed edition is 250,000 copies. I understand that the number is not so very large; there will probably therefore be a repeat edition later. A collection of his poetry will also come out in the "Ogonka" Library. In addition, the All-Union "Melodiya" Firm will release a new album "The Poet Vladimir Vysotskiy," which will consist of 10-12 records. There we will try to present his works in song more fully. Concert recordings will be used, from which one can get an idea of how he dealt with the public. I would like to add that Central Television has completed work on a new program on Vladimir Semenovich (the author is the critic Natalya Krymova). It is a film-meditation on the personality of the artist and his place in our life. The film director Eldar Ryazanov is now working on a full-length documentary film about Vysotskiy.

And there is something else I would like to say. At one time in a conversation with a friend Vysotskiy joked: 'Everything turns out backwards for me. And you know, even if I drown, they'll have to look for me upstream'... You know, it happened just that way: Vladimir Vysotskiy is not with us, but we must not look for him in the past but in the present. And also in the future... "

12424

CSO: 1800/602

FILM ON CHERNOBYL FINALLY RELEASED; DIRECTOR DIES

Kiev PRAVDA UKRAINY in Russian 3 Apr 87 p 3

[Article by Ye. Pozdnyakova: "The Feat of the Film 'Chernobyl: Chronicle of Difficult Weeks'"]

[Text] Everything was going well for a time. Everyone felt fine. But suddenly a misfortune struck--Chernobyl. And this was where the foundations of one's spiritual makeup were laid bare.

Conduct became the main measure of human feeling. In the first days of the accident the camera group "Ukrkinokhronika"--two communists and a nonparty member--tried to get permission to go the atomic power plant region. The film "Chernobyl: Chronicle of Difficult Weeks" began with the desire of the authors of the film to be in the most dangerous place.

There is something to think about when you see the cold houses, the abandoned economy, and the empty towns. And on the roads are lines of loaded vehicles taking people away from Chernobyl.

There is something to ponder when you see how Donetsk miners dig a tunnel under the reactor in 35 degree C. heat.

There is something to ponder when the movie camera's gaze pans the grass and the trees sprinkled with fruit which no one will pick. When following the cameraman we come to the graveyard of cars which are so contaminated that they cannot be used any more, ever.

They were not ready for Chernobyl. But after all, just 20 years ago the future of atomic power engineering was described as a time of prosperity, a time of harmony of man, nature, and technology. This is the price of carelessness, complacency, and self-deception. Deception is a method of the weak, but it is a very dangerous method. And in order to become strong, a person must learn to acknowledge mistakes and confess his weakness.

But such truth about oneself not only does not diminish the dignity of man and society but, on the contrary, engenders a feeling of trust and respect for man and society.

The truth is that the attempt to smooth over and understate the extent of what had happened, as General-Major G.V. Berdov said, prevented us from doing more in the first hours of the accident than was done.

No truth is easy and comfortable. The party called everything by its proper name. And, as the surgeon's scalpel does good through pain, so the word of truth inspired people and called to life the high moral feelings so characteristic of our people. Volunteers sent applications from all corners of the country. People were ready to take on any burden. The screen makes it possible to see the faces of the knights of conscience.

The author's position is clear. It is not in particular statements but in the general impression which the film creates and in the accumulation of ideas, behavior, and life postures of all its heroes. The ability to open up the depth of the soul of a Chernobyl resident (and all those who took part in eliminating the misfortune consider themselves so) without as a rule resorting to psychological analysis and to reveal character in an outwardly commonplace episode is a very important feature of the talented film.

They found one another themselves. V. Shevchenko, V. Kripchenko, V. Taranchenko, V. Kukorenychuk, I. Pisanko, A. Khimich, L. Ryazantsev, and V. Dekhtyar. They tried to take a trip to Chernobyl (but in the first days cinematographers were not allowed there--and there is also bitter truth in that) and they succeeded and proved to be the first of the numerous cinematographic-television fraternity. The group paid only short visits to Kiev: from May through August they actually lived in Chernobyl where they were assigned a room for the "Ukrkinokhronika" correspondent's office. Day after day, week after week, month after month, they filmed the Chernobyl chronicle.

There are frames in the film which the studio OTK [department of technical control] did not at first pass. They considered them defective. Then they understood: radioactive particles had fallen on the film and exposed small parts of it. And there on the screen was the visible face of radiation.

The 20,000 meters of film which were photographed in Chernobyl, of which 1,500 meters went into the film, cost a high price. The desire to get frames important to the film brought the director and the cameraman Vladimir Nikitovich Shevchenko and the cameramen Viktor Ivanovich Kripchenko and Vladimir Vasilyevich Taranchenko to the site of the accident.

In those intense days the artists--they were chroniclers, they were historians, they were warriors--put aside all other work and submitted themselves to one goal: to tell their countrymen the word of truth.

The intensity of those days had an effect on V.N. Shevchenko's health. He became ill but still, with a high temperature, he set up the movie. Because he understood how important it was to bring the truth about Chernobyl to the people promptly. In the fall of last year the film was ready. But its premier was held only recently. And the day before it the well-known director-documentary maker and laureate of the Lenin Prize Dzhezz Firsov spoke out for letting the press see it:

"Can you imagine the picture 'The Defeat of the Germans near Moscow' being released to the audience half a year after the decisive events? The film 'Chernobyl: Chronicle of Difficult Weeks' photographs people who endured all this and were victorious at the price of enormous efforts. But, unfortunately, we do not see the people who are to blame for the film being delayed."

Why was the film made? Probably not only to make us witnesses to the sad events but also to compel us to ponder that each person would answer the main question--whether Chernobyl served as a lesson to us.

The sad news has come out. Vladimir Nikitovich Shevchenko, esteemed Ukrainian artistic figure, laureate of the UkSSR State Prize imeni T.G. Shevchenko, and laureate of the Republic Prize imeni Ya. Galan has departed from life. He departed in the dawn of his creative forces but still managed to accomplish, perhaps, the main feat in his life. After exhibiting personal courage he fulfilled his duty as a communist and an artist to the end.

12424

CSO: 1800/602

JOURNAL DISCUSSES POLITICAL, LEGAL ASPECTS OF GLASNOST

Moscow SOVETY NARODNYKH DEPUTATOV in Russian No 5, May 87 (signed to press 18 Apr 87) pp 18-26

[Article by Candidate of Legal Sciences V. Kryazhkov: "Learn Openness"]

[Text] Openness [glasnost, here and throughout the text unless otherwise specified]-- It is increasingly becoming a genuine norm of our life, an absolutely essential feature and invariable property of it. It is making our existence more sincere and purer, since it is inseparable from the assertion of truth, truthful appraisals of affairs and people, and a principled approach to the discussion and solution of large and small problems of social development. And it is no accident that recently adopted decrees of central bodies concerning the role of the soviets and the enhancement of their responsibility for socioeconomic acceleration emphasize the need for them to expand openness in their work and more fully inform the population about their activities, the course of the implementation of decisions that have been adopted, and the implementation of constituents' mandates.

Openness--an extremely important feature of democracy--contributes to the development of the masses' political creativity and their socially conscious and active participation in management. It inculcates civic-mindedness, provides for the involvement of people in self-management processes, and helps achieve the purposeful action of the masses in all sectors of economic and social and cultural development. This is why our party, working to bring about the development of socialist democracy, sees in openness one of the most important components of restructuring and is striving to use every means to expand openness in the work of party, public and state organizations. The motto is learn to work in conditions of expanded democracy, about which the CPSU Central Committee's January Plenum reminded us anew--learn openness.

For the soviets and their agencies openness is a constitutional principle, and the task is to implement this principle fully and give it a content that accords with the spirit of the times. It is impossible to tolerate an attitude that regards openness as something secondary and supplementary to "basic" work. Openness [otkrytost] should be characteristic of all the affairs of government agencies; it is an essential feature of the soviets' work. In no instance should people be satisfied with pro forma openness--for show, for "points." It is called on to be a strong support in the

accomplishment of all matters. And in order for this to be the case, it is essential that there be constant concern for its improvement. The party demands that "openness be made a flawlessly functioning system." This is the approach that can produce the optimal effect.

But what does it mean to "make openness a flawlessly functioning system"? It presupposes the examination of openness in all of its components and the improvement not just of one single part of it, however important, but of its various aspects and manifestations. First of all, consideration must be given to the quality of the information pertaining to the activities of the soviets and their agencies. Only objective, truthful and reliable information is acceptable. Moreover, such information must be fairly complete information that contains not just positive facts, and not just reports on achievements and successes, but also reports on unsolved problems and shortcomings and omissions in the work of state agencies.

The half-truth, connected with concealment of the true state of affairs, never leads to anything good. And conversely, truthful information about negative phenomena leads to the ending of irresponsibility, bureaucratism, red tape and any deviations from the political, legal and moral norms and principles of the socialist community. It makes it possible to involve broad strata of the working people in an uncompromising campaign against shortcomings, to instill in people an active life stance, and to cultivate in them a sense of proprietorship and of involvement in everything that takes place in the countryside, city, settlement, oblast, republic and country.

We are losing nothing but only gaining from the criticism and self-criticism that have now been deployed. "The people," as M. S. Gorbachev stressed in his speech to Khabarovsk residents, "has felt an influx of strength and has become bolder and more active in work and public life. And you know, everyone who had been trying to circumvent our laws immediately quieted down. Because nothing is more powerful than the power of public opinion when it can be exercised. And it is exercised only in conditions of criticism and self-criticism and broad openness."

Unfortunately, it is absolutely impossible to think that all soviet officials are consistently enough fulfilling the demands that the times make with regard to the content and form of openness. Reports to constituents made by ispolkom chairmen and the heads of ispolkom departments and directors of administrations frequently tell what it has been possible to do but say nothing about what it has not been possible to do and why, and who is to blame for the omissions. We still encounter attempts to hush up cases of abuses and violations of laws and job ethics on the part of some staff employees. There are cases in which employees who tell the truth about the true state of affairs in their regions or branches of the economy are subject to persecution and punishment. All this confirms the timely relevance of the proposition that it is necessary to make new efforts to improve the extremely important democratic principle in the activities of the soviets and their agencies.

It seems that the solution of this problem depends to no small degree not only on staff employees but on the soviet deputies, as well. Granted, the basic mass of data concerning the state of affairs in various sectors of economic,

social and cultural construction is concentrated in the staff agencies. The professional managers have experience dealing with information and utilize special technical means to collect and process it. But it is precisely the specific nature of their work and intrastaff interests that frequently interfere with their making this information available to the outside. Certain officials establish a monopoly on information in an attempt to conceal the truth from the public that they are called on to serve. And if information does go beyond the staff offices, it is by no means always objective.

Deputies, of course, are freer in their judgments and opinions concerning the matters in which the soviets and their agencies are engaged. They are not bound by relationships of subordination. They are not dominated by a desire to justify and embellish the work of the staff at any cost. This is why they can conduct an open and businesslike discussion with constituents about the work of the soviets and their agencies. Of course, the staff should create the conditions for such a discussion--supply the deputies with the necessary information and make the organizational arrangements for their meetings with constituents. However, it must be bluntly said that the staff does not always perform these duties fully. But after all, a great deal here depends on the deputies themselves. Their bold and principled position and exactingness with respect to officials who are called on to supply the people's elected representatives with the necessary information may play a decisive, determining role in the expansion and deepening of real openness in the work of the soviets.

When we speak of expanding openness, we by no means have it in mind that literally all information about the work of the soviets and their agencies should be made widely public. This is impossible to do--such information is too extensive. Moreover, the purely physiological possibilities of utilizing information are far from unlimited. This is why openness is required first of all in the most important, fundamental issues.

The laws speak only about certain types of information that it is mandatory to report to constituents (about mandates, about the approval and fulfillment of the budget). And other types? They are made public at the discretion of the soviets' executive bodies. This is not always the most important information. And attention should be given to this. Obviously, if one proceeds on the basis of the importance of the information that is provided to the public, it should include information about the essence of the most fundamental decisions made by the soviets and their agencies, i.e., decisions that affect the interests of a large number of people, and about the results of their implementation. In all circumstances, it is necessary to give the utmost consideration to the information needs of the public and pay attention to what it expects from government bodies.

Here is what was learned from a sociological survey of residents of Sverdlovsk. Most (from 42 to 56 percent) would like to know about the pluses and minuses of, and specific measures for improving, the work of transport, trade, public health, consumer services and public catering, and about progress in building housing and opening it for occupancy; 20 to 30 percent would like to know about how the work of executive and administrative bodies

is organized, how citizens' appeals are examined and draft decisions are prepared, and the reasons for dismissals of the executives of state institutions. Understandably, in addition to the general information needs of the public, there are also actual, specific ones. There is a need, for example, for information intended for young people, labor and war veterans, mothers of numerous children, the residents of a given housing development, block or street, and the members of a specific labor collective.

In our survey, the relatively weak interest in democratic forms of the soviets' work was noteworthy. However, who is to blame for this? As conversations with the persons surveyed showed, the reason here is that many people proceed on the basis of the nature of the information on these matters that is already reported from time to time in the press and at constituents' meetings with deputies and the officials of soviet executive bodies. And this information is sometimes limited to the mere listing of the issues taken up in sessions and in standing committees, data concerning the number of reports by ispolkoms and their departments and administrations, the number of activists, etc. It doesn't affect people's vital concerns, and therefore it interests hardly anyone.

And once again it is necessary to speak about improving the quality of information provided to the public. It is pointless to count on a real expansion of openness in the soviets' work if a growing quantity of information passes people by without being noticed. Only information that is not merely formal but genuinely substantive attracts attention. It is necessary to talk to people candidly about what is being done to surmount over-organization in the holding of sessions and the work of committees, what unresolved questions there are here, and where efforts are being directed. Constituents should know not just about the active but also about the passive deputies--about those who consider their deputy's title an appendage to their office--not just about the number of activists, but also about the effectiveness of their efforts. Only such objective and complete information can arouse a response in those who receive it, and a desire to get involved in the soviets' affairs and an urge to help their tasks, i.e., can achieve the main goal of expanding openness in the work of government bodies.

In reflecting on improving the system of openness, it is impossible to bypass the question of correctly choosing its organizational and legal forms. They include those that provide for the public's obtaining the necessary information through direct observance of the work of the soviets and their agencies. This is possible when representatives of labor collectives and public organizations participate in soviet sessions and meetings of ispolkoms, standing committees and deputy groups. Here is the opinion of constituents concerning the importance of this form of openness for them: almost one in four of those surveyed in Sverdlovsk would like to attend a soviet session or meeting of its ispolkom.

In this connection it would be a good idea, in our view, to provide for the heterogeneous makeup of those who are invited, proceeding in every instance not just from the idea of a competent and businesslike discussion of the problem, but also from the goal of expanding openness; not to limit but, insofar as possible, to increase the number of nondeputy persons who are

present during the discussion of important issues; to create conditions for those who are invited to take active part in the discussion--inform them in advance of the meeting, provide them with the necessary material, etc.; and to help those who have attended a session or an ispolkom meeting to subsequently tell about what they have heard in their labor collectives or their place of residence.

Visiting soviet sessions and meetings of ispolkoms and standing committees can be considered among the active forms of the open work of soviet agencies. They give the members of these collegial bodies the opportunity to gain a deeper insight into the actual situation and make an effective decision on a broad democratic basis. Meetings are usually held at the initiative of ispolkoms. But the initiatives of public organizations and territorial associations of citizens must not be ruled out, either. These meetings may be organized in various ways, including, for example, the way that one session of the Sverdlovsk Oblast Soviet was organized, the topic of which was the work of the Nizhniy Tagil Gorispolkom connected with expanding the production of consumer goods and improving their quality. Beforehand all the oblast soviet's standing committees held meetings with an analogous agenda at the enterprises of Nizhniy Tagil, with members of the labor collectives and interested persons invited. And it was after that that the deputies continued discussion of the issue in plenary session. The decisions made at that session were distinguished by the depth with which they were substantiated. They were received with interest by the residents not just of Nizhniy Tagil but of other cities, as well. And this, in turn, sped up the implementation of what was planned.

One vivid form of openness is direct, active contact between deputies and officials and constituents. This, in essence, is an extremely important political and legal norm of our state life. V. I. Lenin wrote: "Personal influence and speaking at meetings means an awful lot in politics. Without them there is no political activity..." ("Polnoye sobraniye sochineniy" [Complete Collected Works], Vol 47, p 54). When properly organized, reports and meetings make it possible to inform an audience in an up-to-date fashion and--what is very important--with a view to its specific makeup about the most diverse issues in the work of the soviets and their agencies. Here information is provided firsthand. Moreover, what occurs is not merely the informing of people. A mutual influence and interaction arise between those who present information and those who listen: everyone may express his own viewpoint and simultaneously receive information for reflection. It is natural that personal contacts are highly valued by both ispolkom executives and the public: 35 percent of the Sverdlovsk residents surveyed came out for the need to organize more regular reports and meetings with the officials of ispolkoms, departments and administrations in labor collectives and at places of residence, and 24 percent would like to have more frequent contact with deputies.

There is a great deal of untapped potential in the organization of report meetings between deputies and officials and constituents. For example, it is necessary to work to bring about a situation in which they occur regularly at places of residence and in labor collectives, are arranged not just at the initiative of deputies and officials but also at the initiative of public

organizations and labor collectives, minutes of them are kept, and they contain an evaluation of the performance of those who are reporting, proposals and critical remarks, etc.

Many of the soviets in our oblast are seeking means of raising the level of reports. The Berezovskiy City Soviet can serve as an example. There reports by the people's deputies are, in agreement with them, held twice a year (in June and December) in the course of a previously planned day known as constituents' day. This makes it possible for the ispolkom to prepare reference material in advance, direct enterprise administrations and public organizations to provide assistance to the deputies, and to brief them. Through the publication of special posters and leaflets, as well as through the local newspaper, the public is informed about the upcoming meetings. It is explained what a report is and what obligations it imposes on deputies, and what the rights are of the constituents who are present at a meeting during the report.

Afterwards, the newspaper reports about the meetings with constituents that have been held and tells what problems were discussed at the meetings, what came under criticism, and who will eliminate shortcomings and when. Thus, the reports take place in a businesslike fashion and under public supervision. And this, in turn, is having a noticeable effect on the activeness of deputies and constituents: more and more constituents are attending the report meetings of Berezovskiy deputies, many questions are asked, recommendations are made, and an objective evaluation is given of the performance of the deputies and the soviet as a whole.

There are also untapped possibilities for making other meetings of staff employees and deputies with citizens more substantive. It seems that they should also be arranged on a planned basis and encompass not just the large collectives but also the relatively small ones and people of various occupations, ages and interests. It would be useful to hold them in an unofficial setting: in stores--in a circle of customers, at consumer-service enterprises--with those who use their services, etc. Of course, the ability to freely and boldly conduct discussions, win people over, evoke a response, and conduct a well-grounded debate is no easy matter, but the person who masters this ability always achieves noticeable success in both educational and organizational work.

Now a word about the expansion of openness in the press and on radio and television. It is common knowledge that the mass news media help government bodies provide a large amount of the most diverse information to a wide audience in a timely fashion. This information may be reproduced repeatedly and at convenient times. Effort and time are saved both for those who are providing the information and those who are receiving it. According to our calculations, 54.8 percent of the constituents surveyed turned to the mass news media to receive information about the soviets and their agencies, and nearly half indicated the need to enlist television, and one third--the press, more widely in elucidating the soviets' work.

It must be said that in recent years information about the soviets' work in the press and on radio and television has noticeably improved. Many local

newspapers have added the rubrics, "For the Rostrum at the Soviet Session," "The Soviets and Constituents' Mandates," "The Soviets and the Economy," "Deputies at Work," and "Official Department." Various genres are utilized--essays on deputies, reports from the meetings of government bodies, interviews with the executives of management agencies, "round tables," and others. Series of programs devoted entirely to the soviets run on television. For example, in Volgograd and Krasnoyarsk there is a monthly program, "Deputies' Reception," in which deputies answer television viewers' questions. In Sverdlovsk the television series "Executives Answer Letters" and the traditional pre-New Year's press conference by the chairman of the city soviet ispolkom enjoy deserved popularity. In Rostov and Tbilisi the "Dialogue" series of programs attract viewers' attention, as does the "Forum" series in the Estonian SSR. Responsible party, soviet and economic-management officials take part in them.

At the same time, the new tasks also give rise to new criteria for evaluating the performance of the mass news media. So far the proportion of reports on the soviets in the local press is relatively small (in the Urals it is from one to three percent of the total volume), and they are written and talked about in a hackneyed, dry fashion. This information, as sociological research shows, is not highly regarded by readers. Of the constituents we surveyed, one in two either rarely reads such reports or only looks at some of them, and only one in four reads (or listens to) them in full.

It seems that the main thing is to change the content of publications and programs in the direction of greater depth and more intensive critical analysis of the soviets' work. At the same time, some thought should also be given to organizational measures, which should be expected not just from the press, radio and television, but from the soviets themselves. One of them is to improve the planning of the mass news media's presentations on matters pertaining to the soviets' work. The soviets, in our view, are called on not just to submit recommendations for plans but to analyze them and give them a certain direction. Practice along these lines does exist. For example, the Presidium of the Armenian SSR Supreme Soviet, in discussing the question of the mass news media's publicizing of the soviets' work, instructed some newspapers to do a better job of treating the work of the standing committees, others--to pay attention to the implementation of constituents' mandates, still others--to treat the life of settlement and rural soviets, and the republic State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting--to concentrate on showing the work of deputies. Later it examined and approved the plans of the editorial boards in question. Why don't local soviets also take advantage of this experience?

Unquestionably, it would help matters to supply the mass news media with various data and surveys of the soviets' work, their decisions and other documents, as well as to create favorable conditions for representatives of the press, radio and television to attend all of the most important activities conducted by the soviets. Noteworthy in this connection is the practice of the ispolkoms of certain rayon and city soviets in the Georgian SSR, which systematically inform journalists about what has been done, provide recommendations for articles on timely issues, and do everything possible to help reveal shortcomings in the publicizing of positive experience in the work

of government bodies. Attention also should be given to the experience of periodically hearing reports by newspaper editors and the chairmen of television and radio committees at local soviet sessions, meetings of the Presidiums of Supreme Soviets and meetings of local soviet ispolkoms.

In employing various forms of openness, it is important to combine them skillfully. I shall explain this using the example of reporting on a soviet session. Here the following variant seems optimal. Before the session all the mass news media report on its agenda and the time and place it will be held. The press discloses the significance of the issue being discussed, and radio and television tell about preparations for the deputies' meeting. The deputies meet with constituents and familiarize them with the draft decision. As to the session's results, the radio promptly informs people about the matters that have been considered and the decisions that have been taken, and the television news provides reports from the session. In both cases attention is called to the key points in the reports and decisions. The newspapers carry a detailed report on the event, publish decisions and commentaries on them, and carry deputies' accounts to constituents of the soviet's work and explanations of the content of documents. Later the public receives information through various channels on progress in the implementation of decisions and their results.

In this sense, the reporting on the meeting of the executives and members of the Sverdlovsk Oblast Soviet Ispolkom with the residents of Pervouralsk at which proposals for enhancing the campaign against drunkenness and alcoholism were discussed was, in our view, successful. The city residents were informed of the meeting in advance. The oblast newspaper URALSKIY RABOCHIY described the meeting in detail, informing readers of the upcoming television coverage of it. Several days later television viewers saw an hour-long report at a convenient time for them. Such detailed, interconnected information reached many people and permitted them to acquaint themselves with the ispolkom's work and the process of preparing a decision. What is essential is that everyone got the opportunity to interpret the draft document and express his ideas and proposals regarding its content. The decision that was made, taking the collective opinion into account, was subsequently publicized in the local press.

The times require an updating of the methods of work in all spheres of our life. They also compel us to improve and revise the arsenal of forms of openness. Most likely, consideration should also be given to expanding the use of technical devices and means of direct communication and feedback between the soviets and their agencies and constituents. Practice attests, in particular, to the advisability of the fuller utilization of the telephone for these purposes. Indeed, experience in using it for informational purposes already exists. Through appropriate services citizens receive over the telephone, which is frequently operating automatically, information about the work of transportation, consumer-service enterprises, trade, cultural and public-health institutions, sports, etc. Recently telephone information centers have started to appear in local soviet ispolkoms. For example, at the Rovno City Soviet Ispolkom a public-opinion service has been set up through which everyone has the opportunity, by phone, to express a proposal or critical observation addressed to specific organizations and officials--all

this is recorded by tape recorder and then transcribed on a card, classified according to degree of urgency and transmitted to those responsible for acting on it. If the caller gives his name and address, he receives a response.

In developing such practice, it would be a good idea to expand the information that citizens who utilize the telephone can receive, including the names of executives and deputies, the times at which they receive constituents, the content of the most important decisions made by the soviet and its agencies, etc. Where computers exist, automated "telephone-computer" information complexes should be set up. In the opinion of specialists, this does not entail any technical complexity. On the other hand, it can produce a significant effect in the provision of information services to the public--mainly from the standpoint of time saving and the diversity of the types of information that are provided.

Let us not forget, either, such a new information device as the video tape recorder. They are compact, easy to operate (the copying and showing of films and programs are no more complicated than the use of ordinary tape recorders), and have cassettes with large capacities. Some soviets have already managed to appreciate their advantages. For example, the Sverdlovsk Oblast Soviet Ispolkom uses video tape recorders in organizing visiting seminars, offering their participants subjects from the experience of soviet work, and not just that of the oblast soviet but on an all-union scale. The required video recordings are made at the oblispolkom's request by film and television studios. The following practice has become widespread in the Asbest City Soviet Ispolkom: in addition to the traditional factual information and drafts, the ispolkom and standing committees prepare, for their meetings, video materials that are screened during discussions. These are visual arguments "for" and "against" proposed decisions, and they are more persuasive than numerous reports and speeches.

Existing experience demonstrates that videos can also successfully serve the purposes of expanding openness. Taped discussions at soviet sessions and ispolkom meetings and taped speeches by staff executives explaining complex matters of state, economic, social and cultural construction could be shown at constituents' clubs and agitation stations and in labor collectives, schools, higher schools, dormitories, etc. In some cases the showing would complement a meeting of a deputy and soviet official with constituents and make it more substantive and attractive, and in others it would assist in the educational process in connection with the study of relevant problems in the political education system, the reading of public lectures, the holding of political information sessions, etc.

From what has been said it is clear that constant concern for the expansion and deepening of openness cannot fail to lead to a certain increase in the amount of work of soviets and their agencies. This must not be feared; outlays of time and effort will be recouped many times over. At the same time, it is impossible to avoid a certain improvement in efficiency in order to organizationally reinforce the changes in the style and forms of work. And once again we must refer to the developing practice of a number of local soviets and accumulated experience that will help take the most correct action.

Is it necessary to set up special subdivisions in the system of ispolkom departments that would concern themselves with ensuring openness and would help the deputies, standing committees, staff and government body as a whole to systematically inform the public? This question is being discussed in many soviets. At the lower levels, where the volume of information and the number of people for whom it is intended and territory they cover are not so great, one must assume that an ispolkom secretary (with the possible assistance of a volunteer body set up for the purpose) is perfectly capable of performing this function. In local soviets at the middle and higher level, the tasks are more complicated, and for this reason it makes sense for them to have staff employees, who could even take the form of special groups in kray and oblast bodies. These employees (or agencies) in the local soviets' staffs should, in our view, belong to the organization and instruction department. It would be better if they acted as part of soviet-work offices (or deputies' rooms). Offices or rooms presently concern themselves with information methods work and analytical work and generalize and publicize soviets' proven advanced practices. Assistance in providing information to citizens about the government bodies' affairs would be a natural extension of this work. This is the path that has been taken by the soviets in Moscow and Gomel oblasts.

Specifically, the duties of employees called on to assist in ensuring openness could include: the systemization and preparation of information for dissemination and the regular conveying of it to representatives of the press, radio and television, labor collectives, public organizations and citizens; participation in the preparation of bulletins and similar soviet publications; the organization of television and radio programs, and assistance in holding meetings of deputies and officials with the public; the monitoring, coordination and analysis of information processes, the generalization and publicizing of the best experience, and the training of personnel; the provision of assistance in scientific research and the practical application of its results.

And the last thing that must be discussed, with a view to the development of openness as an effective system, is the need for its more clear-cut legal regulation. The materials of the CPSU Central Committee's January Plenum directly emphasize: the time has come to begin drafting legal acts that would guarantee openness. They should ensure the maximum openness [otkrytost] in the work of state and public organizations and give the working people a real opportunity to express their opinions on any issue of public life. It has been mentioned above that openness is constitutionally defined as an element of socialist democracy and a principle of the soviets' work. In certain legal norms these constitutional provisions are spelled out concretely. This, in our view, is not enough. The legal regulation of openness must be deepened. It would be a good idea, in particular, to establish procedures for making public the decisions of local soviets and their agencies, for the presentation of reports by deputies and executive and administrative agencies, and for citizens' obtaining of necessary information in institutions, etc.

Of course, prior to the adoption of appropriate legislative acts, the local bodies themselves can adopt normative measures aimed at expanding openness.

Examples of this sort already exist. Thus, the Gomel Oblast Soviet Ispolkom adopted a decision "On the Further Improvement of the Provision of Information to the Public on the Work of the Oblast Soviets and Their Agencies," as well as recommendations on enhancing openness.

The drafting of such comprehensive decisions (recommendations) is the most preferable alternative, although, of course, prescriptions on procedures for informing the public can also be included in the regulations of soviets and ispolkoms. In all cases, consideration should be given to the experience of soviets' work and real conditions, and a general rule should be invariably observed: the local soviets have the right to establish norms expanding openness and guaranteeing its reality, completeness and comprehensiveness, but in no case should they narrow citizens' opportunities to obtain information stipulated by law. And such a thing, unfortunately, does occur (for example, the regulations of certain soviets name, among those who are to be informed of the decisions of soviets and their ispolkoms, only those who are to carry them out, and they make no mention at all of citizens).

And so, the expansion of openness is an urgent political task that is inseparably bound up with the idea of deepening socialist self-management by the people and with the improvement of our democracy--goals that are clearly designated by decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress and cited in party decrees and the materials of the CPSU Central Committee's January Plenum. Turning openness into a permanent and effectively operating system requires a change in thinking, the addition of knowledge, and constant and purposeful efforts. The functioning of such a system presupposes: the full implementation of the principle of openness in the work of soviets at all levels, as well as their agencies, deputies and officials; the provision of the public with complete, objective and truthful information that critically analyzes the real state of affairs; and the creation of appropriate organizational, technical and legal prerequisites, with the help of which the system of openness can unfold and manifest itself in proper fashion.

COPYRIGHT: Zhurnal "Sovety narodnykh deputatov", 1987

8756

CSO: 1800/644

LEGAL SCHOLAR DISCUSSES ERRORS IN PRETRIAL INVESTIGATIONS

Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 22 May 87 p 3

[Discussion by journalist Yu. Feofanov with Candidate of Juridical Sciences and Colonel of the Militia A. Gulyayev: "Before the Verdict Is Delivered"; first paragraph is source introduction]

[Text] The central phase in the criminal proceeding is, of course, the trial. But there is a while before the case reaches the court... The preliminary investigation ["predvaritelnoye sledstviye"] is the most protracted and--very much, sometimes too much--determining stage of the whole proceeding. People have written and spoken about mistakes in this particular stage quite often in recent times. What are the origins and causes of these mistakes? Journalist Yu. Feofanov discusses this subject with Colonel of the Militia A. Gulyayev, a candidate of juridical sciences.

[Feofanov] The mistakes mentioned in the introductory paragraph cannot be called anything but tragic. The explanation is often given that they are a "fatal coincidence" of circumstances, inadequately qualified investigators, the complexity of investigating evidence, and the like. All this probably has a place. But it certainly is no justification! Do you agree, Anatoliy Petrovich, that the mistakes are most often predetermined, so to speak, by the investigator's position as accuser. And the fact that in practice he is hardly responsible at all for mistakes. And pressure from higher-ranking, influential people, sometimes complete outsiders. In short, these mistakes are criminal. It is naive to expect the investigator to suddenly "reform." More substantial guarantees are needed. You study the problems of the preliminary investigation. What can be done so that the law stands above the investigator, not, as unfortunately happens, the other way around?

[Gulyayev] The idea of the independence of the investigative apparatus has already been expressed. Really, it is hard to grasp any clear criteria for delimiting the authority of MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs] and procurator's investigators. The need for investigation is sometimes determined according to who opened the case. After the existing codes of criminal procedure were adopted in 1961 there have been 20 changes in determining the need for investigation. And there are many paradoxes in this. For example homicide and rape committed by adults will be investigated by the procurator, while the same crimes committed by minors go to the MVD.

Therefore, it is hardly possible to find convincing grounds for splitting up the investigative apparatus. According to research findings, most of the investigative mistakes (about 60 percent) are identified during trial court hearing of the cases, and the initiative in identifying such mistakes belongs to the procurators in just one case out of six.

As far back as 1924 N. V. Krylenko, a prominent Soviet legal figure, said that making investigators subordinate to the procurator's office would do nothing to improve investigative work, it would only burden procurator supervision with administrative functions. Unfortunately, the position of Krylenko and his follows was not taken into account. But in fact, it corresponds entirely to V. I. Lenin's idea that "the procurator has the right and is obligated to do just one thing: see that a truly uniform understanding of legality is established."

Making investigators subordinate to the heads of internal affairs organs is hard to justify too. It does not ensure procedural independence of the investigation from operational services. And the latter frequently use any means to maintain their figures for solving crimes. In short, Both subordinating the investigation to the procurator's office and intertwining it with the operational-search services have a negative effect on the state of legality and justice.

[Feofanov] As far as I know, you stated this view a long time ago, as other scholars have too, incidentally. But everything is still the same. And since the investigation does make mistakes, let's think about it: how can they be eliminated right now, immediately? Organizational shortcomings certainly do not explain everything. There are investigator mistakes which cannot be called anything but criminal. The Chinese say: "It is hard to catch a cat in a dark room, especially when he isn't there." But these people are "catching" them!

[Gulyayev] If certain actions or decisions of an investigator are criminal, we are no longer talking about mistakes. Mistakes are another matter, and have to be evaluated with different measures. For now let's dwell on mistakes themselves, and not on deliberate violation of the law. The investigator's work has a probing character. Often it is necessary to check different versions, which inevitably entails summoning and interrogating people, inspections, searches, and sometimes detaining suspects. Let me remind you that detention (for up to 72 hours) is permitted by law. Of course we have to try to see that the investigator's actions are always on target. But we also have to be realistic: the investigator does not have a clear picture of the event in front of him. And it would hardly be correct to indict the investigator for every case where a suspect is detained and it is later established that he was not involved. In reality we permit the investigator a certain justified risk. Let me give an example. Four 10-kilogram packages of a powerful narcotic were stolen from a warehouse. The crime had to be solved as quickly as possible, before the stolen goods could be hidden and sold. There were no traces, and the locks were undamaged. The search took four lines of action at once: the warehouse clerk, the people who delivered the stolen drug to the warehouse, the warehouse workers, and persons who were aware of delivery of the drug. Several persons who aroused particular

suspicion were detained. Practically every step they took, every minute of their actions on the day of the theft and afterward was checked. The crime was solved in a few days. Innocent people were drawn into the orbit of investigative actions, including searches and detention. But what was to be done? They all received apologies, and losses were reimbursed. But it would hardly be fair to reproach the investigator in this case.

[Feofanov] Your example of an investigator's determined actions seems persuasive. But once I was sitting in the office of a chief investigator. One of the investigators came in and said that they would have to get approval to take a certain person under guard. "What grounds?" the chief asked. "She won't testify," the investigator answered, naively, not embarrassed in front of an outside. But I was dumbfounded by this "naivete." Tell me, is that an isolated case? But according to the law the preventive measure of incarceration under guard is selected if there is reason to believe that the accused will go into hiding, hinder the investigation, or commit another crime. Are these conditions really followed in practice? Have you heard of an accused person in a large theft not being put under guard? Even if the above grounds do not exist? Then what is their purpose? If you ask me, the investigator often resorts to another measure that is more convenient for him: only according to the seriousness of the crime. And so it comes out that on paper the citizen has guarantees, but in reality what is convenient for the investigator is what happens.

[Gulyayev] All the same, investigators usually get along without arrests. But unfortunately, we sometimes run into cases where of the arrest of an accused person which would be hard to explain on any other grounds than a desire to bolster the "weight" of the investigative materials or put mental pressure on the accused, and even on the court. The case of K. was investigated in Adygey Autonomous Oblast last year. There were two opposed lines of thought: intentional grave bodily injury, or grave bodily injury inflicted by exceeding the limits of necessary self-defense. There were no grounds for an arrest, but even so they put him under guard right before the trial. There can only be one explanation--this was done to bolster the position of the investigator and the procurator before the trial. It is no secret that the preventive measure has a certain influence on the court's position: it is easier to find people guilty and, as a rule, deprive them of their freedom, which is what happened in the case of K. But if the defendant had been at liberty at the time of trial it could have been different. This is unlawful determination by the investigator.

Now to talk about arrest simply because of the gravity of the crime. Sometimes the crime by itself illustrates the danger of leaving the accused at liberty and the probability that he may commit another crime, hinder the investigation, or hide. The indignation and anger of the citizens and the victims must also be taken into account.

[Feofanov] You have not convinced me, Anatoliy Petrovich. A person is not considered guilty before the verdict. But you talk as if everything were already proven.

[Gulyayev] We permit arrest because of the gravity of the crime, of course, where there is convincing evidence of guilt. But there is some sense in what you say. All you have to do is look at the codes of the Union republics; there is complete confusion on this issue there. As you know, the codes list the articles that define the gravity of the charge.

[Feofanov] That is a fairly serious matter. I would like to see that the process of making the articles uniform is not done at the expense of our citizens. I was interested to read your book "Sledovatel v ugolovnom protsesse" [The Investigator in the Criminal Proceeding]. You have a short chapter in it entitled "The Principle of Publicity [publichnost]." I'm sorry, but I didn't find any publicity in the form of openness ["glasnost"] there. Everything in the preliminary investigation is done secretly. Publicity would be ensured by giving the attorney access to the preliminary investigation; that would be a real guarantee against arbitrary actions. Our newspaper itself has made such a suggestion. I have heard investigators say: no way, otherwise we could not guarantee the secrecy of the investigation. But what is interesting is that the attorneys are afraid! They are afraid that they could be accused of divulging this very secret. But isn't the need for secrecy exaggerated? Or let's put it this way: eliminating improper methods of investigation is, if you ask me, work letting out any secrets.

[Gulyayev] In the first place, by "publicity" jurisprudence means presentation of the indictment by a state organ. Openness is something different. And the so-called "secrecy of the investigation" is greatly exaggerated. There are no special secrets. Therefore I favor giving the defense attorney access to the preliminary investigation. Obviously we have to think about additional guarantees, as well as about how to protect the attorney against unfounded accusations. But this should not sully the actual principle of democratizing the preliminary investigation.

[Feofanov] But the stage to which the attorney will hardly be given access is the immediate investigation ["doznaniye"]. It is chiefly carried out by the militia. As far as I can tell, it is sometimes done by people who do not have adequate qualifications and even perform other functions, a precinct inspector for example. Is he capable of properly investigating a crime? And after all, immediate investigations are done for crimes for which loss of freedom is envisioned too. And the file is sent directly to the court. In other words, there are not even the guarantees envisioned for the preliminary investigation.

[Gulyayev] I agree. More violations of citizens' rights occur in the immediate investigation. It gets ridiculous. One precinct inspector, having found some "braga" [type of home-brewed beer], poured a glass for the lay observers and used them as witnesses to testify to the alcoholic content of what they had drunk. Another, before turning the confiscated "fermented product" over for expert examination, put it in a warm place to let it finish out. And methods like these are used to get "evidence" of crimes for which loss of freedom is envisioned!

I think that there is no good reason to preserve the immediate investigation. In my opinion, it should be completely excluded from criminal procedural law.

[Feofanov] I have to admit that those are bold suggestions. Suppose there is only the preliminary investigation. Where are the guarantees against mistakes in this phase? We still have not answered the main question: what are the sources and causes of those "mistakes" that the investigator makes deliberately, using improper methods, as you personally call them.

[Gulyayev] Of course, you can refer to the fact that we do run into very complex "considerations." But this doesn't make it any easier. The accuracy of the legal assessment or, as lawyers say, the classification of the actions is so serious that we cannot look for any justification for mistakes. And the point here is not just lack of proper classification. A rule has taken root in the practice of investigative organs: in doubtful cases the action is classified at the "maximum." Wanting to "insure themselves" against the file being returned and considering that the court has the right to switch to a less serious classification, investigators often classify the accused's actions according to a more serious norm of the criminal code, with a "margin of safety," so to speak. It doesn't seem that there is any malicious intent here. But this practice is very dangerous. The investigator himself is captivated by this assessment and tries to find a basis for it. This leads to the use of stricter preventive measures. Finally, an exaggerated classification can "pop up in" the verdict. Appeal and supervisory experience shows this.

Here is one example. The director of the office for a group of filling stations issued an order establishing a selective procedure for checking used rationing coupons instead of checking them all when turned in for storage and destruction. Dishonest employees took advantage of this. By falsifying report documents they stole used coupons worth 15,000 rubles. No criminal association between the director and the thieves was established. His most serious offense was carelessness. Nonetheless, he was sentenced to 10 years as a accomplice in the theft. The USSR Supreme Court changed the sentence to one year for carelessness. That is the price of an "exaggerated assessment!"

Strange as it seems, the practice of exaggerating the classifications of actions does not cause any special concern in the criminal procedural organs. Why is that? I have already talked about the ideas of investigative workers. But the procurators too are uninterested, for the same reasons, because to have the case returned for additional investigation is a shortcoming in their work.

[Feofanov] Doesn't it seem to you, Anatoliy Petrovich, that all these investigators' "tricks," their overcautiousness and other things that you have talked about, can be explained very simply by the fact that there is practically no punishment envisioned for officials who have enormous power over persons who have not yet been found guilty? After all, the press is reporting real torture-let's call things by their correct names. You cannot explain them by "coincidence of circumstances" or "poor professional training." On the contrary, everything is done very professionally, with malice. And who is accountable? In reality it is often laughable. I would

envision the gravest penalties, "all the way," for improper, which honestly means criminal, methods of investigation. Wouldn't that be fair? And wouldn't it have a preventive impact?

[Gulyayev] Your emotions are completely understandable. And the idea is generally correct. Abuse of authority which threatens a person's honor and dignity, his freedom and health, is a very grave crime. I agree that current practices with penalties for such actions need some correction. But "all the way?" I doubt that. Believe me, I am not defending the honor of the uniform. But still, the main thing is to organize the investigation and procurator's supervision so that such a question is not raised.

11176

CSO: 1800/634

MVD OFFICIAL ANSWERS CRITICISM FOR MINISTRY'S POOR PERFORMANCE

Moscow CHELOVEK I ZAKON in Russian No 6, Jun 87 (signed to press 21 Apr 87)
pp 6-15

[Interview with Vasilii Petrovich Trushin, USSR first deputy minister of internal affairs, under rubric "Implementing the Decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress": "In the Special Attention Zone"; first two paragraphs are source introduction]

[Text] Under the conditions of restructuring and its concomitant processes of democratization, a task that has posed itself with exceptional acuteness is the task of the further reinforcement of socialist legality and law and order, and the intensification of the protection of the citizens' rights and interests. There has been a substantial increase in the requirements with regard to the effectiveness of law-enforcement work, including the work of the internal affairs agencies, which bear a considerable burden in the fight against crime and other undesirable situations.

What is being done concretely to assure the successful fulfillment of these requirements? What problems are in the center of attention of USSR MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs] and its subordinate agencies after the 27th CPSU Congress and the January 1987 Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee? What changes have occurred in their work after the enactment of the CPSU Central Committee's decree entitled "The Further Reinforcement of Socialist Legality and Law and Order, and the Intensification of the Protection of the Citizens' Rights and Legal Interests"? These and other questions became the subject of a discussion that our correspondent had with Vasilii Petrovich Trushin, USSR first deputy minister of internal affairs.

[Question] Vasilii Petrovich, as is generally known, the party's Central Committee has deemed it necessary to restructure the work of the law-enforcement agencies. Our readers would like to know the directions along which that restructuring is proceeding in the internal affairs agencies and what real results one can already observe today.

[Answer] The personnel in the internal affairs agencies unanimously approve the party line that is aimed at the reinforcement of legality and law and order and are perfectly aware of the entire degree of their responsibility for implementing the practical measures that were set down by the Central

Committee and that found the complete approval of the nation -- the measures to improve the moral atmosphere in society and to fight undesirable situations, primarily crime, drunkenness, narcotics addiction, and illegal income.

An understanding of the profound political and moral meaning of the tasks that are being carried out today to guarantee law and order is the point of departure and a very important component of the restructuring. Therefore the questions that have been brought to the forefront in the Center and in the outlying areas are the questions of educating the personnel and of developing in every worker a conscious, truly party attitude toward the job that has been assigned.

Much has been done to improve the official-operational work. The contacts with the labor collectives and the public are being reinforced. It has become a broader practice to study public opinion concerning the work of the militia. People have begun to perceive with interest and to employ in other regions the experience in this work that has been accumulated by our Georgian comrades. In Gorkiy Oblast, reports by the UVD [internal affairs administrations] and the city rayon agencies at major enterprises are being organized on a planned basis. In Leningrad a practice has been introduced for regularly providing the newspapers, radio, and television with information concerning the situations that have occurred during the previous 24-hour period, and the measuring being taken by the militia to prevent or discover crimes. It would seem that in these first outcroppings of the new experience one can discern the attempt to achieve those organizational work forms that correspond to the restructuring conditions.

The increased requirements on the effectiveness of law-enforcement work have necessitated the change in certain organizational structures. For purposes of restructuring the system of administration, organizational-inspection subdivisions have been created everywhere. These subdivisions have been required to analyze the state of law and order, and on that basis to prepare time-responsive recommendations for steps to react to the changes in the situation. The duty units have been reinforced, inasmuch as the precision of their work largely determines the level of the official-operational work of every agency and subdivision. Special subdivisions have been organized to fight drunkenness and narcotics addiction, and to prevent or discover especially dangerous crimes.

[Question] Am I correct in thinking that there has also been a change in the approach to the work with cadres?

[Answer] Much has been corrected in carrying out cadre policy. The artificially applied layer of distrust of the cadres, of indiscriminate suspiciousness, and of completely unjustified reassignments has been removed. Simultaneously there has been an increase in the exactingness toward the administrators at all levels for restructuring the management style. The proper evaluation is being made of those who retain their preference for "paper work," for various kinds of meetings and conferences, and for the "tribunal" method of communicating with their subordinates. The factor that is considered to be of paramount importance is the person's level of

proficiency and competency, his ability to see and to support that which is new, and his ability to listen attentively to his subordinates' opinion and to analyze in a self-critical manner his own blunders and shortcomings. Administrators who are subject to especially rigid inquiry are those who tolerate violations of legality and who show a liberal and unprincipled attitude toward those who commit violations of the law. During recent time alone, the USSR MVD board deemed it impossible for these reasons to continue to use the following persons in the positions that they occupied: V. P. Myaukin, Karelian ASSR minister of internal affairs; A. S. Kokorev, chief of the UVD of the Tambov Oblast ispolkom; B. K. Alekseyev, deputy chief of the Personnel Administration of USSR MVD; and a number of other administrators.

[Question] Am I correct in thinking that additional measures are also being carried out to improve the official-operational work at the basis level -- the level of the city and rayon internal affairs agencies?

[Answer] Herein lies the crux of all the restructuring problems. At that level one guarantees the real success in reinforcing legality and law and order. Proceeding from this understanding of the problem, we are resolving the questions of increasing the size of the operational complement that is working in the city rayon agencies and the number of militia district inspectors. We have defined a system of personnel training and retraining that corresponds to today's requirements. We are looking for opportunities to allocate to this area additional technology, motor transport, and means of communication. In this process we have rejected the approach that used to prevail -- the approach of complete equalization, of distributing cadres, tables of organizations, and equipment according to the principle, as the expression goes, of "giving each sister one earring each." We are carrying out and developing, with a consideration of the specific work conditions, target programs for reinforcing the city rayon agencies in the petroleum-gas rayons of West Siberia, in the Far Eastern oblasts, and in the places where territorial-production complexes are being formed.

During the past year one has noted a number of positive tendencies in the dynamics and structure of crime. There has been a reduction in overall crime, and a reduction of 15.6 percent in its serious types. There has been a 20-25 percent reduction in the number of premeditated murders and instances of aggravated assault; a reduction by one-fourth in the number of instances of assault and battery and robbery. There has been a noticeable reduction in the number of thefts and hooligan acts. There has been a noticeable reduction -- by 26.3 percent -- in "drunken" crime. All this is primarily the consequence of the positive changes that were brought to life by the party's active and all-encompassing work to establish firmly in society an atmosphere of exactingness and demandingness and to expand and deepen socialist democracy, as well the consistent and purposeful work to eradicate drunkenness and alcoholism, narcotics addiction, and unearned income. The law-enforcement agencies, including the internal affairs agencies, have been resolving more energetically the tasks that have been placed before them.

At the same time we are far from overestimating the contribution made by the internal affairs agencies to the improvement of the operational situation. The aggressiveness and effectiveness of operational and preventive work can

and must be considerably higher. In Uzbek, Kazakh, and Turkmen SSR, Karelian and Udmurt ASSR, Krasnoyarsk and Khabarovsk krais, Volgograd, Irkutsk, Kaluga, and Tambov oblasts, in a number of major cities, and in the areas where territorial-production complexes are being formed, the situation is being improved slowly. Serious complaints are being lodged by citizens concerning instances of the unpunished commission of individual crimes. The workers are upset by the unreliable guaranteeing of their property security. One-third of the thefts remain unsolved.

The USSR MVD board, summing up the results of the official-operational work during the past year, directly remarked that the basic reasons for this situation lie in the slowness in carrying out the restructuring, and the fact that little reliance is still being placed on the labor collectives and the public. Many MVD agencies obviously lack the ability to carry out law-enforcement work under conditions of the democratization of society, the intensification of openness, and the increase in the responsibility for the guarantees and the real protection of the rights and freedoms of Soviet citizens and for the strictest observance of socialist legality. In this regard, a series of additional organizational, education, cadre, and other measures have been defined and are being implemented.

[Question] How do you explain that in a number of republics and oblasts, and in certain ministries and department, large groups of crooks and bribe takers operated with impunity for a long period of time, and it is only now that they have been unmasked? What shortcomings do you see in the work of the internal affairs agencies, primarily the BKhSS [Struggle Against Embezzlement of Socialist Property and Speculation] service, in locating and curtailing the criminal schemes of such "businessmen"? What specific steps have been carried out or have been planned to improve the work of the BKhSS subdivisions?

[Answer] Actually, during the past two years the law-enforcement agencies scrutinized the activities of a considerable number of criminal groups, many of which were headed by persons occupying rather high official positions. Large-scale organized misappropriations were revealed in the trade system, light industry, at enterprises in the agroindustry, in the Goskomnefteprodukt [State Committee for the Supply of Petroleum Products], medical institutions, higher educational institutions, and the services sphere. The prolonged existence of these groups received a sharp political evaluation on the part of the CPSU Central Committee as a phenomenon that fundamentally contradicts the interests of Soviet society and that is incompatible with the socialist way of life.

One must admit self-critically that the internal affairs agencies are also to blame for the easing up in the struggle against misappropriations. The BKhSS apparatuses were staffed with insufficiently trained workers. The shortage of professional knowledge, the low level of management, and sometimes the lack of any precise political orientation markers, led to a situation in which the BKhSS apparatus "accumulated points" by recording obvious infringements of the law, but did not take any decisive steps to curtail the criminal activity of major crooks and bribe takers.

The correction of the situation that was created required a thorough analysis of the previous miscalculations, and the learning of object lessons for the future. Therefore an exacting analysis of the cadre situation was carried out. The materials pertaining to criminal cases involving major thefts in the Ukraine, Uzbekistan, Kazakhstan, Moscow, and Volgograd have shown that certain workers in the MVD system proved to be involved themselves in criminal schemes, protected crooks and speculators, and provided them with information, and, in other words, took the path of betraying the interests of their official duty. They have all received the punishment they deserve, have been evicted from the party, and brought to court. The persons who are now being investigated include [Yu. M.] Churbanov, former USSR first deputy of internal affairs; [Kh. Kh.] Yakhyayev, former UzSSR minister of internal affairs; and Ivanov, former chief of the UVD of the Volgograd Oblast ispolkom; and a number of other persons.

Additional billets have been provided to the BKhSS service, and the management of that service has been made the direct responsibility of the first persons in the MVD, UVD, and the city rayon agencies. Well-trained persons who have a knowledge of production and who, on the basis of their political and professional qualities, are capable of coping with the sector assigned to them, have begun working in these apparatuses, having come by way of the party agencies and labor collectives.

And there is something else. People in the Center and in the outlying areas have studied the territorial and branch distribution of the thefts, and have defined the so-called criminogenic objectives that require constant attention on the part of the BKhSS service. For example, many conditions that promote thefts continue to exist at meat-processing enterprises. During the past two years approximately 2000 thefts and more than 200 instances of bribe-taking were established there. More than 1500 managers, other officials, and bookkeeping and accounting workers participated in the commission of the crimes.

A problem that has become a very acute state one is the unfavorable state of affairs with regard to the intactness of socialist property in the agroindustrial complex, which accounts for more than half the losses resulting from embezzlement and thefts in the national economy.

Something that requires increased attention is the intactness of freight shipments in rail transportation, where the thefts, spoilage, and cannibalizing of the motor-vehicle and agricultural equipment being carried cause annual losses that exceed 2 million rubles.

The fight against the obtaining of unearned income is a problem not only of the BKhSS service. A place in that fight is also assigned to the investigative apparatuses, to criminal investigation, to the district inspectors, and to subdivisions of the GAI [state motor-vehicle inspectorate]. They are required to coordinate their work, to carry out that work every day, and to strive constantly to close off all channels by which people can obtain unearned blessings or privileges.

The situation in this sector of the fight for law and order and for legality cannot be considered to be satisfactory. During the past year a large number of violators of the law were revealed to have obtained unearned income, and almost 250 million rubles of illegally obtained money, property, and valuables was confiscated from them. In many oblasts there has been an increase in the damages in criminal cases involving thefts. Therefore USSR MVD evaluates in an acutely critical manner the current work level of its subordinate agencies in eliminating unearned income, keeps that sector under constant surveillance, and holds strictly accountable the managers who have eased up in organizing the work of the BKhSS service and the other subdivisions that are responsible for preventing self-seeking violations of the law.

One cannot fail to mention another important aspect of the question. The fight against unearned income must be carried out in a well thought-out, carefully weighed manner, and in no instance must affect the interests of honest persons. Before the Law Governing Individual Labor Activity went into effect, USSR MVD sent special groups to the outlying areas in order to prevent the slightest twistings and turnings and unjustified interference in economic-organizational and other questions pertaining to the practice of execution of the law. Honest people who, by their labor, are helping to resolve important state problems, must be assured that their rights and interests will be reliably protected.

[Question] All types of experts in giving people the wrong change or weighing produce incorrectly, and in charging for spillage and shrinkage, are continuing to feel rather self-assured. There has been almost no reduction in the number of petty pilferages at industrial enterprises. The petty thieves each take a small amount each time, but they do so on a regular basis, and therefore they inflict losses on the government that amount to millions of rubles. Is it possible that an end can be put to this in the near future?

[Answer] The mail sent to USSR MVD also contains a rather large number of letters on this vitally important question. There are good reasons for serious concern. The fact of the matter is that petty pilferages not only inflict an economic loss, but also inflict immeasurable moral damage, demoralize people, and reduce, as the expression goes, their "sensitivity threshold" in evaluating the antisocial and, consequently, amoral behavior of individual citizens.

The proliferation rate of petty pilferages is also attested to by the following facts: during the past year, property valued at a total of approximately 4 million rubles was confiscated from those who are called petty thieves. The internal affairs agencies are taking steps to combat this evil. The nondepartmental guard is being reinforced by new cadres; more rigid demands are being made on economic managers to create reliable procedures for inspecting people as they leave work; new methods for increasing the effectiveness of examination are being introduced; a signal-alarm system is being installed; etc. Workers of the BKhSS service, the district inspectors, and GAI personnel have been oriented toward the preventing of petty pilferages. In other words, all manpower and equipment that are at our disposal have been thrown into the struggle. However, we feel that the main reserve -- openness; the real participation of the labor collectives

themselves in educating and re-educating those who are light-fingered; and the introduction of proper order in accounting and storing output -- has not yet been activated.

It is necessary, by means of the combined efforts of the militia, the public, and the labor collectives, to take major steps to correct those managers who, while concealing their own idleness, talk about petty pilferages as though they some kind of inevitable compensation for the difficult, unprestigious work performed by individual categories of workers. We have heard such discussions at meat processing plants and other enterprises in the food industry. It is by no accident, for example, at at the Arzamas meat processing plant in Gorkiy Oblast, workers who recently were detained for pilferages are now receiving bonuses. And this is at a time when every other member of the collective is caught with stolen meat products.

One's attention is also drawn by the fact that many petty thieves have their own clientele, their own sales market. It would seem that they do not steal much, but the total result is very impressive. Two "petty thieves" who were detained in Gorkiy had confiscated from them stolen products with a total value of 35 rubles, but it was discovered that they had 21 savings bank passbooks with total deposits of 92,000 rubles, two GAZ-24 cars, and other valuables.

[Question] Nevertheless do you assume that it is possible to combat petty pilferages more effectively?

[Answer] Life and everyday practice convince us that this is possible, if one resolves the problem on the basis of a comprehensive approach, making complete use of the entire arsenal of economic, cadre, educational, and legal means. There is a rather large number of collectives where, on this basis, one could achieve tangible shifts and completely resolve the question of petty thieves. Their experience, and in particular the experience of the Minsk Poultry Factory imeni N. K. Krupskaya, should be studied everywhere, and people should adopt as standard equipment everything that is acceptable with a consideration of the peculiarities of the specific enterprises.

[Question] The letters to the editor include letters in which citizens complain about prejudice and lack of objectivity in the course of the inquiry and the preliminary investigation, and they report unjustified detentions and even arrests. Why are such situations possible, and what is being done to eliminate them?

[Answer] The ministry board, when determining the program for practical actions to fulfill the mentioned decree of the CPSU Central Committee, remarked that the slight reduction, during recent time, in the number of instances of violation of laws by personnel in the internal affairs agencies does not provide any justification for complacency. The state of affairs is being corrected, but we feel that it is being corrected at an inadmissibly slow rate.

What are the reasons for this? One of them consists in the fact that many managers in the outlying areas at one time overlooked the processes by which

distorted ideas concerning professional merits and priorities were developing in the awareness of certain workers. The ability that those personnel began to put in the foreground was the ability, with impunity, to bypass the law or even to break it directly, in order to achieve what appeared formally to be favorable indicators, primarily with regard to the disclosing of crimes. It is also obvious that the moral and professional breakdown of certain investigators and operatives could occur only under conditions of an insufficiently organized mechanism of official surveillance, and of stagnation in the work of providing the legal education and instruction of the personnel. A negative role was also played by the fact that, for a time, the demands on the grounds for instituting criminal cases were reduced. And that brought with it a chain of subsequent errors, including those linked with illegal detentions, searches, and accusations.

If one characterizes briefly the essence and purpose of the measures currently being taken to eradicate violations of legality, one can summarize them as follows. Every instance of unjustified detention or other violation of citizens' rights is viewed as an extraordinary event, and an official investigation is immediately carried out concerning it, in order to make sharp, uncompromising conclusions with respect to the guilty individuals. The question is resolved only in this manner: the violation of legality objectively places the violator outside the system of the USSR MVD. Subdivisions where even individual instances of violation of legality have been noted in recent have been determined and put under special monitoring. A precise system has been established for monitoring the making of decisions pertaining to legal proceedings, which decisions affect citizens' rights. Special attention is paid to the inadmissibility of interference into the investigation by officials who have not been endowed with the rights of monitoring legal proceedings. The question of centralizing the management of the investigative subdivisions is being resolved. It is planned to subordinate the investigators directly to the corresponding administrations of the MVD in the union republics and to the Main Investigative Administration of USSR MVD.

The key area for reinforcing legality is the further expansion of openness, the consolidation of the ties that the militia has with the labor collectives, the public, the population. The condition of legality has been taken out of the zone that is closed to the workers. Information concerning these questions will be provided regularly to the labor collectives and the population. The duty units of the militia now have a special book in which citizens can enter their recommendations and comments concerning the work of the particular subdivision.

There has been a re-examination of the programs for instructing trainees and student officers at educational institutions, and for providing official training for all personnel, so that their knowledge of the laws will combine organically with their personal conviction concerning the need to execute those laws in the strictest manner, with high overall and professional efficiency and deep respect for people.

All this has one goal -- the complete elimination of instances of unjustified detentions and arrests, or the illegal bringing of citizens to criminal or administrative responsibility.

[Question] What measures are planned for improving the work of the district inspectors? About 20 years ago the people living in any building knew their district militia man, so to speak, by his face. They did not know just the district militia man, but also knew the state of affairs with law and order in the housing area or city block. Today the situation has changed fundamentally. Many people do not have any idea of where they can find the district militia man. It may be that, for the time being, everything is going well in the building, and there is no particular need to know this. Nevertheless, regular meetings with the public would probably be beneficial for both sides.

[Answer] You have posed the question completely correctly. Improving the work of the militia district inspectors who are constantly working amid the public is an acute problem that is an especially important today, under the conditions of restructuring. Attaching great importance to increasing the role of the militia district inspectors in protecting public order and reinforcing the ties that the militia has with the public, the labor collective, the volunteer people's "druzhinas" and other public formations, it has been decided to carry out measures to improve their work and to improve their material support. The task of the internal affairs agencies in the outlying areas is to shift the planned measures onto practical tracks, to strive constantly to see that the district militia man becomes, in the best sense of the word, the boss of the housing area. He must know the people, and they must know him. He must work meaningfully to re-educate violators of the law, he must maintain public order firmly, and he must give no quarter to drunks, parasites, and rowdies. We are striving for a situation in which the district militia man has an apartment in the district that he is serving, an official area where he can receive citizens, an apartment telephone, and an official telephone. In this way it will be possible to get in touch with him, to find him, and ask him any question at any time. Naturally, all this information -- that is, the telephone numbers, the location of the official areas -- will be made known to all the residents of the districts being served.

USSR MVD is resolving the question of reinforcing this, the largest detachment of militia officers both qualitatively and quantitatively. We are opening a number of special higher educational institutions to train them and are allocating additional billets, including those obtained by reducing the administrative links. We are introducing a rather broad list of incentive measures for those who work with all their heart and soul, and are creating for people all the necessary conditions for calm relaxation and productive labor.

Obviously, the militia district inspectors are obliged, in response to the concern and attention shown to them, to take serious steps to improve their work, to be completely responsible for the state of law and order in the district assigned to them. The procedure whereby the public and the labor collectives listen regularly to oral reports given by the district militia men will exert its influence on increasing the responsibility. These meetings and reports are being put on a planned basis that can be monitored.

[Question] Vasilii Petrovich, is it planned to introduce any changes into the organization of the patrol-post service? When darkness falls, practically the only places where the post militia man or the patrol vehicle can be seen are the subway stations and along a well-lighted highway. But in evening, in the courtyards and alleys that are remote from the lively streets -- that is, in those places where most of the robberies and assaults are committed -- there's no way that you can call a militia man. What is a person supposed to do?

[Answer] I would like to make the proviso that the reserves for the quantitative buildup in the number of militia men are not unlimited. If we can speak directly, those reserves have been practically exhausted. At, then, is the way out? We see this way out in improving the placement of the details with a consideration of the situation that is developing and in the more flexible shifting of the manpower, so that it will always be at the necessary place at the necessary time. We are establishing close contacts with the headquarters of the volunteer people's "druzhinas." The "druzhina" members and the members of the Komsomol operational detachments render tangible assistance to the militia. Most of them, in response to an inner call and their civic duty, have selflessly and unselfishly undertaken this difficult civic assignment. Last year they participated in establishing more than 70,000 criminals, and they accounted for one-third of the detained petty hooligans and one-fourth of the violators of the anti-alcohol legislation.

The readers have apparently noticed that when they are out in the streets they are more likely to meet a detail consisting of a militia man and "druzhina" members. That means that we have succeeded in transferring the other militia man (usually the militia men conducting the patrols work in pairs) to another district. There has been an improvement in the rate at which the militia men are provided with means of communication. Experimental tests are currently under way in Moscow, to test an automated system for controlling the details, which system opens up great opportunities for rapidly shifting manpower and equipment. There has been good experience in organizing the protection of public order in Kursk, Belgorod, Brezhnev, and a number of other cities.

But the technical-organizational measures, in and of themselves, do not get things going. It is necessary to carry out painstaking, daily work to educate and train the militia men. If the person on duty at the militia post is a person who is equipped with state-of-the-art equipment, but who is heartless and callous in dealing with other people, who does not worry about their repose and security, the benefit derived by placing him there will be minimal. Hence the increasing requirements with regard to the militia man's personality traits, his culture, his tact, and his ethical manner in his interrelations with people.

[Question] We have already become accustomed to the situation in which the replenishing of the ranks of the internal affairs agencies, for example in Moscow, is basically done by drawing on people from other cities. Moreover, many of them do not even have special education. Is this practice justified? What is the reason for it?

[Answer] We began this discussion with questions of cadre policy in the internal affairs agencies, have touched upon them in the course of the discussion, and are returning to it at the conclusion. This is natural, inasmuch as the success of the job is determined by people.

As for the staffing of the militia in Moscow, your observations are basically correct. Actually, until last year the share of persons from other cities among the persons who were brought on board varied from 60 to 70 percent. The shortcomings of this approach to staffing are obvious. The new replacements did not know the city or the working conditions. The young militia men directed their basic efforts toward getting established in the city themselves. Every fifth person, disappointed about the work conditions, quit. On the initiative of the CPSU MGK [Moscow City Committee], the errors that were committed in staffing the Moscow militia are being corrected. The center of gravity of the work of selecting candidates for service has been shifted to the labor collectives of the Moscow plants, factories, and other enterprises and organizations.

As for the general-educational and special training of our cadres, this is the situation that has been developing. Not a single person who is brought on board -- and this pertains primarily to the rank and file -- is permitted to begin performing his duty independently until he has graduated from special courses. Training centers for this purpose have been created everywhere. The overwhelming majority of the operational-command staff in criminal investigation and the BKhSS, and the district inspectors have higher secondary special education. Special requirements apply to investigators -- all of them must be graduates of institutions of higher legal education.

Without a doubt, the decisions of the January 1987 Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee require us to re-examine many of the evaluations of the work with personnel which have become traditional and customary. We have begun a search for new forms and methods that are aimed at restructuring the entire system of selection, assignment, instruction, and education of the personnel. With the active support of the party agencies, we are expanding the practice of hiring persons who are sent by labor collectives and by party and Komsomol organizations. Approximately 70 percent of the personnel have been brought into service by this method. We are establishing the rule by which these persons must give an oral report annually to those collectives that recommended them for admission into the militia.

We are changing the system of retraining, in order to prevent the situation when a person stops in his ideological-political and professional growth, lives on the basis of obsolete experience, and as a result lags hopelessly behind today's requirements and loses his ability to look into the future.

We are shifting onto the tracks of practical decisions and specific measures the task of devoting increased attention to the national cadres. A number of comrades from the union republics are currently being sent to the central apparatus for probationary work. These comrades will be a kind of reserve for the subsequent formation of the administrative nucleus of the appropriate ministries, administrations, and city rayon agencies.

One of the chief trends in the search for effective means for improving the work with cadres is the confirmation of democratic principles in the life of the militia collectives. The open discussion of the candidates recommended to fill the vacancies, the certification of the personnel with the participation of representatives of labor collectives, and oral reports given by administrators to the personnel -- these constitute a far from complete list of the new educational forms that have been suggested by life itself, forms which will undoubtedly yield their results and make it possible to guarantee a major change in the minds, psychology, and practical actions of the militia workers.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo "Pravda", "Chelovek i zakon", 1987.

5075

CSO: 1800-729

PUBLIC OPINION STUDIES URGED TO REFLECT DIFFERENT VIEWPOINTS

PM161549 Moscow SOVETSKAYA KULTURA in Russian 11 Jun 87 p 3

[Article by Candidate of Historical Sciences N. Popov, senior scientific staffer of the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of the United States and Canada, under the rubric "Echo of 'Direct Speech'": "The 'Voice of the People' Under Conditions of Openness"; capitalized words within slantlines published in boldface]

[Text] At all times, as is known, it was customary to defer in public to the people's opinion. Politicians at different ends of the world, particularly with the development of bourgeois democracy, claimed to know the true interest of their people. The church and writers believed that they sensed the soul of their believing and reading "flocks." Journalism nowadays reflects in one way or another the dominant sentiments in society, sometimes it has a presentiment about them, and it frequently influences them. The question is how to really and reliably recognize and evaluate public opinion and how to make use of it in governing the country. This is particularly important under the present conditions of revolutionary transformations in society and in the development of not only representative but also direct democracy.

Replying to questions from the editorial board of the Italian newspaper L'UNITA, M.S. Gorbachev emphasized: "We are convinced that our socialist society, which has moved resolutely along the path of restructuring and democratic renewal, is extremely interested in ensuring that everyone--whether a worker, kolkhoz member, scientist, or representative of the artistic intelligentsia--makes an independent, individual, and original contribution both to the discussion of plans and decisions and to the efforts to implement them." Professor B. Grushin's recent article in SOVETSKAYA KULTURA speaks of the urgency of this task.

Here, in my opinion, it is most important of all to speak not of academic research (however important it might be) but of a "snapshot" of the present state of the mass consciousness and of your and my opinion of what is being done in the country today.

Things here are still worse than with sociological science as a whole. Instead of really measuring mass opinions and sentiments, making them public, and discussing them in public, for long years repetition of the

usual slogans reigned: "The entire Soviet people came out unanimously in support..." But there is nothing that the /ENTIRE/ people would come out in support of. There will always be a certain number of people who will object for one reason or another even to the best initiatives. The reaction to innovative, unusual, disputatious proposals which affect in different ways the interests of different social groups will be all the more equivocal. And it is extremely essential to know these /DIFFERENT/ viewpoints of people if we want these people to participate actively in the implementation of particular programs.

What, in fact, were we afraid of? That the people would not support party and government policy? Seventy years of living under the socialist system and the defense of Soviet power with weapon in hand at the cost of tens of millions of lives ought to have convinced us, you might think, of the people's allegiance to the chosen political course, as well as to the definite package of ideas of social justice, humanism, inalienable rights, values, and principles of society's organization. As regards specific plans for the development of particular sectors of the country's life, projects large and small, here too there must be no complete like-mindedness or "nationwide" support. Here there can be and must be different trends of thought and diversity of opinions. What is more, it is precisely the existence of open and, most importantly, audible criticism of particular projects that can play the role of a safety device built into the system--to use technical language--to warn that not all mechanisms are working normally.

There have been enough instances in our history where suppression of criticism has had sad consequences for the country, whether in agricultural policy, the position regarding genetics, cybernetics... This series could be continued right up to recent events concerning the diversion of northern rivers, and so forth.

Today we know that both public and individual opinion is expressed and taken into account according to the very same principles of socialist democracy as had been utilized very poorly until recently. These include the citizen's right to voice his own opinion on any question, and openness, above all in the press, which enables society to know different viewpoints on important problems.

Unfortunately, the development of democracy is a far from rapid process. How frequently we say: "You see, he alone is marching in step, while all the rest are out of step." In the army, indeed, when marching in formation, all must lead with the right foot or all with the left, while in society just one person might prove to be right. But, most importantly, he must have the right to express his opinion openly and without fear. One of the usual cliches is "the people are always right" (on a historical plane--yes, but in specific cases large groups, classes, and peoples can all be mistaken). If the opinion of a person or a group of people differs from what is generally accepted, their views and activities have frequently been tagged "antipopular." This prefix "anti" (it has often been fateful for people in the past), attached also to other terms, has been used repeatedly to describe people with "inconvenient" views.

The tenacity of undemocratic traditions is in many respects associated with the misinterpreted principle of democratic centralism and its automatic extension to the life of all of society. The rule of subordinating the minority to the majority and ceasing all debate after a decision has been made applies, above all, to a party whose members, on joining it voluntarily, pledge to follow these principles and fulfill the rules. In society a person must follow the laws and know and honor the constitution. And debate must proceed, if there are discussants, regardless of the adoption of any administrative decision.

Despite the period of stagnation in the recent past, our society has not lost the spirit of innovation and youth, as evidenced by the new informal organizations and forms of activity which are emerging here and there and by social inventions already aimed at the next century. At the same time, we seem to have attained a certain maturity as a country and as a political system, and we are beginning to rid ourselves of the "youth inferiority complex," as a result of which we sought to prove to everyone that we are the best in everything--the strongest, the richest, and the happiest. Particularly the latter--we are all content with everything and support everything.

This maturity and confidence in the potential of our social system give us the right to boldly admit our many errors, shortcomings, and problems, as well as the acute struggle in society over the ways to develop it. We do not now wince so much as we used to when people in the West point to drug addiction in the USSR, the desire of some people to leave the country, or resistance to restructuring. We learn of all this earlier from our own press.

The press now is the "voice of restructuring." However, in order to really evaluate the nature of the acute struggle being waged in society and the obstacles in the way of revolutionary transformations, we must hear also those who are in no hurry to restructure themselves. Of course, there is in each of us a conservative trait and resistance to breaking with customary foundations, work methods, and relations among people. Therefore many people, while desiring restructuring in the country as a whole, are really in no hurry to reorganize anything around themselves. And there are others who object to economic accountability [khozraschet] and a "return to the new economic policy," yet others who are against the "legalization of private operators," still others (terrible to say) against the anti-alcohol drive, even others against the Phil Donahue programs, and so forth. Of course, opponents of restructuring or of individual aspects of it do not live in any one place, do not wear a common sporty uniform, and probably will not go and demonstrate in front of the Moscow City Soviet, like members of the "Pamyat" Society. However, their voices must be audible in the present, increasingly manifold public chorus, even if they seem to be spoiling the melody. Since there are people who all the same "object through action" (or inaction), it is better to know such opinions and sentiments in full. In order not to repeat old mistakes, we must develop a tolerant attitude toward those who disagree (even those who disagree with a good thing), if only for the sake of developing traditions of democratism and openness and so as not to freeze at some time opponents of a new bureaucratic or technocratic venture.

We must realize that the voice of the people is not always pleasant, that we might hear something "immature" and unpredictable which does not fit into the schemes of social science textbooks. And that public opinion will contain contradictory judgments, because there are many contradictions in society.

At the same time, whoever wants to hear all this multitude of voices must realize that the opinions of individuals, sections, and groups are also full of internal contradictions and frequently mutually exclusive judgments--it is a far from scientific system. It is hard to say now, for example, what percentage of people believe in ghosts, although there are plenty of strange ideas about.

Many of the opinions that are expressed are people's profound convictions, for which they are prepared to fight, others are, rather, a repeat of typical judgments, particularly if the problem does not affect the person individually, and yet others are just conjectures reflecting, to use Marx' expression, "vague formations in people's brains." On this plane there is frequent talk of the problem of the informed nature of public opinion, which, as B. Crushin rightly points out, "very often turns out still to be poorly informed and not competent enough for active participation in management."

Some people might say that this is plainly not the "voice of God," meaning that the gauging of public opinion and, still more, its broad illumination should be treated with great caution, so as not to be under its thumb, not give the ideological opponent food for fabrications, and so forth. In fact, this has always been the basic principle--"caution" in information; with it we overlooked drug addiction, prostitution, and much besides.

But public awareness of our society today, its cross section, a photograph in the form of public opinion--this is what really exists, and we have no other in reserve.

Of course, public opinion is a manifestation of collective reason. But what if "collective reason," because of insufficient competence, makes a mistaken, immature, faulty judgment; if, for example, the majority of the population or, say, the majority of men comes out in polls against the antialcohol measures that have been adopted? Several approaches are possible here. First, no one proposes to turn such public opinion polls into an alternative to the legislative process. Second, it makes more sense to conduct such polls /BEFORE/ particular important decisions are adopted, not /AFTER/, so as to have time to develop educational and teaching work among the population. It will be clear from the aforementioned example that television and newspapers have not shown convincingly enough the harm that drunkenness does to society and to everyone's health, or the propaganda has been unsophisticated, or else everything has been done on impulse, in the form of a routine mass campaign. In any case, mistaken, unconsidered judgments submit to educational influence. Finally, instances where explanations do not work and organs of power have to adopt unpopular

decisions are perfectly possible. They have been adopted before and, evidently, will also be adopted in the future; only previously such decisions were frequently accompanied by the explanations "meeting the working people's wishes..." which no one had even bothered to ascertain, whereas now, under conditions of broad democratization, it will be far more appropriate to tell people the unpleasant truth and give them time to grasp it for themselves.

In general, if you look at this new business from the sidelines, it might seem that it creates more problems than it solves. And so it does, in fact. This could also be said with regard to all restructuring and openness in the press. The revolutionary process of breaking with the old does not make life simpler, at least at the first stage. And it infringes the interests of very many people and undermines the calm flow of life. However, we need a study of public opinion as part of this process now, not tomorrow. Restructuring, like an earthquake, recedes away from the epicenter toward the periphery of public life. What is needed to really accelerate the transformations and refashion economic, political, and social practice is a real shift in mass activeness.

It seems, for example, that many people are still not fully aware that there will be no return to old forms of management and that restructuring is not just another campaign. For all the understanding of the importance of the moment, inertia is so great in many people that not even material incentives can budge them from the usual path. In order to shift the masses, awaken their initiative, and really involve them in restructuring and the management of society, it is more necessary than ever today to really represent all nuances of mass views and sentiments on questions of restructuring. It is not enough now to know, for example, that more than 90 percent of people approve of restructuring, while just 0.6 percent disapprove. For such customary "nationwide approval" and support "in general" are something akin to an easy jog--and jogging on the spot moreover. It gives rise to little other than dangerous, unjustified calmness. This is just the same as asking people whether they approve of progress.

Who will study the entire spectrum of opinions, who is interested in this? As has repeatedly been the case with us--everyone in general and no one in particular. B. Grushin writes that real changes will come about only when workers in the management sphere come to understand that public opinion is not a "poor relation" but an ally and a "very important factor and mechanism" for enhancing the efficiency of their activity. I fear that many of them will not understand this, at least in the very near future. Why should a ministry, for example, particularly a laggard ministry, study and publish the public's opinion of its laggardness? It already receives more than enough complaints to want to indulge in self-flagellation as well.

However, society and the entire country need this study; the mobilization of the masses and of the human factor at a qualitatively new level has been named among the most important tasks in our party's recent documents. It is important to get the matter moving--including starting, with the help of the press, with the fact that we do not have a well oiled system of

national, all-union public opinion polls. It is necessary to create one and, above all, a reliable network of interviewers, a mathematical, computer base, and much besides. But let us suppose these mainly technical problems have been solved. Do we want to have a single huge center for recording public opinion--a kind of "Central Statistical Administration of Opinions"?

Perhaps large centers are needed, but, in general, it is necessary at once to create a ramified network for the study of public opinion, representing different approaches and different emphases and topics. Perhaps three directions at least. One of them is academic: sociological institutes and centers under universities and corresponding faculties, preferably in each republic. The emphasis here could be on more profound and long-term study of trends in public opinion, its dynamics, and the reasons why opinions are formed and changed. Another direction is centers under state organizations which, at the same time as tackling social statistics, could also study public opinion. Finally, the mass media could conduct independent polls. And here we return to the IOM [possibly Public Opinion Institute], which once functioned in KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA thanks to B. Grushin's enthusiasm. Like many things in our sociology, that pioneering initiative burned itself out some 20 years ago. Perhaps the poll services in newspaper editorial offices and television studios should not be the biggest, but they can and must be there. The press has its own special interest in people's opinions and needs--they are their readers and viewers. So, there is a taste for this.

But the need for different methods of assessment, for an alternative analysis of the state of public opinion is the chief reason why a ramified network is needed. Just as we need a unified scientific methodology for gathering sociological information, conducting polls, and processing data, we also need diversity of assessments. Clearly, one "supernewspaper" is not enough to speak with a single voice with different audiences. Nor is one "supercenter" enough to listen to and evaluate the "voice of the people," which is, in fact, a strong, multivoice chorus with its own soloists, basses, and trebles; but also with singers who do not remember the words and only mumble, as well as ones who have absolutely "no ear for music." However, such a one does exist, as it were. And in order to conduct this chorus, you must be able to listen. Of course, under conditions of developing openness these assessments--academic ones and ones by state organizations and the press--must receive extensive coverage in the press. And this, in fact, is half of the whole matter, and probably the most important half.

Of course, with the expanding network of polls and the growing "fashion" for them, there is a danger of primitive methods proliferating, when "homemade" investigations will start to be conducted and passed off as "public opinion." But this is happening all the same. A television journalist and a cameraman go into the street and say: "We will now conduct a public opinion poll." Half of the people to whom they put

questions shy away from the microphone, while the other half repeat truths from yesterday's editorial. In this way we have already obtained "nation-wide approval" in the past. But it is better to have a "mania" for questionnaires than a "phobia" of them. The only guarantee of the quality and profundity of assessments is their plurality, a clash of opinions during open discussion, and, most importantly, openness. So that the people can hear from one side what their voice sounds like.

/9604

CSO: 1830/611

BORDER GUARD CHIEF DISCUSSES AGITATION WORK

Moscow AGITATOR in Russian No 10, May 87 (signed to press 29 Apr 87) pp 28-30

[Article by Major General N. Britvin, chief of the Political Directorate of Border Troops of the USSR State Committee for Security: "Guarding Soviet Frontiers"]

[Text] "The State Border is sacred to us. It is the banner of the border troops, and to allow our banner to go unprotected by armed forces for even a minute is to permit a crime." These lines are from the first instructions to men of the border guard, formed in 1918 under a Decree of the RSFSR Soviet of People's Commissars and signed by V. I. Lenin. The border guards carry out Lenin's mandate as a sacred duty.

...Kashka-Su Pass in the spring of 1927. A squad of border guards under the command of Master Sergeant A. Sidorov was blocking the path of a criminal band that had thrust over the border. Seven Red Army men against 200 armed bandits. Taking shelter in an old shepherd's winter hut, without food or water, the men beat back constant enemy attacks for 10 days. They knew that help would not reach them in time. Only after the border guards had fired their last cartridge at the enemy were the bandits able to set the hut on fire. Their brothers-in-arms, arriving at the site of the battle, read the heroes' last words to their comrades on the shield of a machine gun, taken from under its fused remains: "April 1927. Hail to communism!" and the signatures of the deceased.

The memory of the defenders of Kashka-Su is alive on the southern border. In the winter of 1963 Captain V. Astafyev's detachment won a difficult battle with armed smugglers. In August 1971 on this same border Sergeant V. Safonov's detachment skillfully and precisely neutralized armed scouts. In this battle Gennadiy Semenov, a boy from the Urals, gave his life to detain one of the offenders.

More than 250 border guards have been awarded the Gold Star of Heroes. The names of 110 sentries of the Soviet Border who have marched into immortality live on in the names of outposts and ships and many others have been permanently enrolled on the personnel lists of border troop subunits.

The border guards of our days do not forget these lessons. They see them as unfading moral guidelines. They teach the science of selfless loyalty to the Homeland and our ideals and revolutionary hatred for the enemies of communism.

During the night between 8 and 9 April of this year a band of Afghan "dushman's" who had been trained and outfitted by Western special services invaded USSR territory. The Soviet border guard detail took on the unequal battle. Komsomol member Aleksey Kurkin detected the enemy and gave the command to do battle. Border guards Ramil Yamilov and Aleksandr Artamonov were steadfast and courageous. The battle was long and cruel. The "dushman's" were trying to earn the pay which was used to encourage them in their black deeds. The border guards wiped out 14 bandits in the encounter. They took a fifteenth prisoner.

Border service has never been easy. In our day, where imperialism has unleashed "psychological warfare" and stepped up the subversive activities of its special services, the fighting men of the border need truly iron endurance.

Detaining any uninvited guest is a test of the loyalty to the oath and military duty, courage, and endurance of the men who were boys not long ago. For example, Lieutenant V. Spirin, political worker of the N outpost, and Privates S. Agafonov and S. Medvedev recently distinguished themselves. On forested mountain terrain in rapidly thickening twilight, crossing a flood-swollen river several times, they were able to catch and detain a well-trained offender. The border often generates such situations.

We are justly proud of the precise work of the checkpoints. With the broadening of international contacts the stream of people and vehicles crossing the Soviet border is constantly growing. Inspecting and formally authorizing them makes special demands on the general, political, and legal sophistication of the border guards. They have to carry out their missions quickly and properly and always remember that the enemy operates in refined and active ways. Much evidence of this can be given. For example, passport controller Warrant Officer M. Avdyakov personally identified 20 violators of the border who were trying to get into the USSR with skillfully forged documents.

The emissaries of Western anti-Soviet propaganda centers and their henchmen, following carefully worked-out programs, secretly and impudently, calling for "personal freedom" and excusing themselves when caught by claiming to be ignorant of Soviet law, try to bring in all kinds of spiritual poison, from Hitler's "Mein Kampf" and incendiary NTS and Zionist publications to narcotics and filthy pornographic television serials.

The joint work of communists at checkpoints, customs services, railroad stations, and maritime and air ports to instill high vigilance in fighting men and working people plays a large part in the fact that the enemy's ideological sabotage and large-scale smuggling operations on international communications lines fail.

Sea-going border guards, in close cooperation with coastal outposts, technical observation posts, and aviation subunits and with active help from working people in the commercial and fishing fleets, are successfully performing their missions of protecting the state border and maritime economic zone. Operating in a determined and resourceful way, in exact conformity with legal norms, they have given many useful lessons to those who like to make profits from our natural resources.

Our border guards must withstand thousands of provocations. Their honor, incorruptibility, and moral and ideological steadfastness is tested. Various methods are used, from offering "souvenirs" and drinking to trying to tender large bribes. The purpose is the same--to compromise military servicemen and turn them to criminal associations.

When we say that our Soviet borders are safely locked, we are referring above all to the multifaceted dependability of our people: moral-combat, physical, and especially ideological-political dependability. Many of them are from border guard families, such as the son and grandson of Hero of the Soviet Union N. F. Karatsupa.

The "Brother Replaces Brother" movement that arose on the border in the 1930's continues today. The young people who arrive with recommendations from labor collectives are giving a good account of themselves. The Astrakhan Ship Repair Yard has maintained links with one of the Far Eastern outposts for many years. The Kiev Arsenal Production Association has sponsored a border detachment for decades. Some of the outposts have that name--Arsenal.

For 17 years now V. I. Smolin has been head of the detachment of young friends of the border guards that he found in the town of Alekseyevka in Saratov Oblast. More than 100 young men from Alekseyevka have served on the border in various years. Each year a new group of recruits prepared by him departs for the outposts. "I served on the border and I will be loyal to it until the end of my life," Viktor Ivanovich says.

Many people have been taken with the idea of setting up a "Border Guard" club, as Lt Col (Res) B. I. Chertykovtsev did in Kuybyshev. The club is conceived as an association of the hundreds of former men from the outposts who now live in the oblast, to involve them in military-patriotic indoctrination of young people and preparing them for service on the border. Among our people service in the Chekist troops is considered especially honorable and obligates the draftees to many things: they are entrusted to guard the first meters of Soviet soil, the beginning of the Homeland.

The immediate concern for molding high moral-combat and ethical-political potential in the fighting men lies with the commanding officers, political workers, and communists. This potential is not simple to form. We see many unresolved problems that affect the quality of the tempering of military personalities. They come out especially clearly today, when commanding officers, political organs, and party organizations are evaluating their achievements from the standpoint of the demands of the 27th CPSU Congress and the January Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee.

The meetings of party activists and Komsomol conferences that have been held have revealed many unused opportunities to increase protection of the guard on our border, improve the training of units, outposts, and ships, strengthen regulation order, and improve the indoctrination of fighting men. Elements of formalism, unnecessary regimentation, and a lazy approach to assessing the state of political indoctrination work, plus occasional instances of replacing it with bare administrative measures, have been discovered. This means we must be more exacting in evaluating our attitude toward the actions of communists, especially leaders. Under army conditions, where one-man command remains the inflexible foundation of vital activities, this means a great deal. Not everyone finds it easy to combine the authority of a commander with painstaking work to mold high consciousness in personnel, with closeness to the men in spirit and personal irreproachability in observing regulation requirements and the norms of socialist morality. In some cases it is necessary to resort to administrative steps and part with people who have sullied the rank of officer.

The political organs of the troops see their role as acting as the ones who inspire restructuring ["perestroyka"]. They try to see that military cadres thoroughly grasp the missions of the day, rely more fully on the party and Komsomol organizations to activate the human factor, and establish an atmosphere of intolerance for falseness, abuses, and bureaucratism. Fixed attention is being given to the social sphere: what are the working and living conditions of the men, and how well are they supplied with all necessities?

The process of restructuring is in the hands of the communists themselves, the officers and all personnel of the subunits and ships. Success depends crucially on how demanding the voice of the military press and civil conscience is. It is changing from a moral category into a key factor in achieving good results in service and discipline.

The main thing is clear--what we need is for all military cadres to understand the need for changes and be capable of bold, decisive actions to improve control of the service activities of all troops elements and the methods and procedures used to perform their assigned missions, including training and indoctrinating personnel. We must help these cadres achieve real results and persistently introduce new developments.

At the same time, the political organs and party organizations are waging a struggle against the passivity and indifference of certain communists. The party organization of the border ship where S. Merkushev is secretary has done many useful things on this level. When taking reports and communications from communists at the party bureau and meetings there they always carefully analyze the personal contribution the communists have made to strengthening order and solidifying the collective, where they have prevented possible misdeeds, who they have helped to correct mistakes, and what part they take in agitation and propaganda work. The answers to these and other questions permit them to make error-free judgments about the person's posture in life.

Passivity can be harmful, especially when the leaders of troop, party, and Komsomol collectives suffer from it. In a situation where outposts and ships

have a certain autonomy, it inevitably leads to a series of large and small defects which affect the stage of affairs and are reflected in the men. This applies, for example, to the organization of socialist competition. It still contains a good deal of formalism.

It applies to increasing the role of Komsomol organizations in the life of the troops; profound processes of becoming aware of new possibilities are taking place in them now, and interesting ideas are arising, called to life by the spirit of the 20th Komsomol Congress. Setting aside cliches and prompting, the Komsomol can be much more effective in promoting solidification of collectives, elimination of negative phenomena in the military milieu, and rooting out the non-comradely relations that sometimes arise between soldiers drafted earlier and new recruits.

In many cases it has been difficult to eliminate the tendency in the work of party groups to hold meetings at the expense of daily work with actual people and broad participation by communists in all activities conducted in subunits.

Ideological practices also need change. Military sociological studies show that for border troops with their highly dynamic rhythm of life we need less time-consuming forms of political training, methodologies that include elements of problem-oriented learning, and better ways of keeping personnel informed.

Border troop schools face a difficult task: strive for a situation where the border troops will see their graduates not only as demanding chiefs but also as senior comrades, sensitive and accessible, men who understand young people and their desires well. In short, real commissars.

Life compels us to take a new look today at strengthening our ties with the local population too. Thousands of volunteer people's guards are active in border regions. Many violators of the border and border rules are detained with their constant assistance. Nonetheless, strengthening military-patriotic indoctrination of the population certainly does seem to be a significant reserve for raising the level of order in the border zone and on the border.

An example of a business-like approach to performing this mission was shown in the Baltic region, where the Central Committees of the Communist Parties of these republics, together with the military council and political branch of the Baltic Border District, thoroughly analyzed work to carry out the Law on the USSR State Border at a meeting of the secretaries of border raykoms and gorkoms of the party and outlined effective measures to step up work to instill vigilance in the population of the border area.

A great deal of work is to be done on restructuring. It will touch many sectors of troop activity, but at the heart of it will always be the main force, the most important element in protecting the border--the human being.

Like all our people, the Soviet border guards are preparing to greet the 70th anniversary of Great October in a worthy manner. In these days they are more acutely aware of the link between the changes taking place in the country and the ideals of the revolution and of their own responsibility for defending the

gains of socialism. This is a solid foundation for instilling the fighting men with high political vigilance, courage, and ideological steadfastness and can guarantee new successes in defending the sacred frontiers of the socialist Homeland.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda", "Agitator", 1987

11176

CSO: 1800/636

END

END OF

FICHE

DATE FILMED

September 10, 1987

D.S.